





BOOKSELLER:  
PALL MALL.

EX BIBLIOTHECA



CAR. I. TABORIS.







29308/A











AN

ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY,

CONTAINING THE

*Lives of Ancient Fathers and Modern Divines,*

INTERSPERSED WITH NOTICES OF

HERETICS AND SCHISMATICS,

FORMING

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN EVERY AGE.

BY

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D.,

VICAR OF LEEDS.

VOL. VI.

LONDON:

F. AND J. RIVINGTON;

PARKER, OXFORD; J. AND J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE;

T. HARRISON, LEEDS.

1850.

LEEDS:

PRINTED BY T HARRISON,

BRIGGATE.





## PREFACE.

IN this Volume the Reader will find some names familiar to the ear as household words; while Ecclesiastical History is further illustrated under the articles of Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, and St. Jerome, in reference to the Primitive Church; of Hildebrand, Huss, Lanfranc, and Langham, with reference to Medieval Christianity; of Latimer, Knox, and Jewel, with reference to the Reformation; of Hooker, Hoadley, Hough, Ken, Kettlewell, and Laud, as respects the later periods of the English Church.

I am indebted to the Rev. GEORGE WYATT, Rector of Burghwallis, for the Life of Heylyn.

The article on Bishop Berkley, in a former Volume, was contributed by W. P. Wood, Esq., M.P. By a mistake, the acknowledgment was not made in the proper place.

I have to express my obligations to the Rev. J. A. BEAUMONT, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Leeds, for the kindness and care with which he has superintended the passing of this and the three preceding Volumes through the Press.

W. F. H.

VICARAGE, LEEDS,

*January 1st, 1850.*





## ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY.

---

HERBERT, GEORGE.

GEORGE HERBERT was born in 1593 at Montgomery Castle, and educated at Westminster School, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1619 he was chosen university orator, which office he held for eight years, much to the satisfaction of his hearers, and particularly of those great personages whom he had occasionally to address. On more than one occasion he pleased James I. very much, whom he also pleased by his apt and ingenious replies to Andrew Melville, the Presbyterian demagogue, at the Hampton Court conference. His talents recommended him to the notice of the celebrated Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, and of Lord Bacon, who is said to have entertained such a high opinion of him, as to consult him in his writings before they went to press; he also dedicated to him his translation of some of the Psalms into English verse. Being at this time a favourite with the king, and “not meanly valued and loved by the most eminent and

most powerful of the nobility," he began to cherish hopes of rising at court. With this view he frequently left Cambridge to attend the king, and he seldom visited Cambridge unless when his majesty was there. But, as Walton says, "God, in Whom there is an unseen chain of causes," terminated his hopes of rising at court by the deaths of the Duke of Richmond and the Marquis of Hamilton, his chief patrons, and, about the same time, by that of King James. The loss of these friends appears to have given a new turn to his mind. He now left London, and went to the house of a gentleman in Kent, where he lived in great privacy, and, after having taken a careful retrospect of his past views and hopes, he determined to dedicate himself to the ministry.

"He did on his return," says Isaac Walton, "acquaint a court friend with his resolution to enter into sacred orders, who persuaded him to alter it, as too mean an employment, and too much below his birth, and the excellent abilities and endowments of his mind. To whom he replied, 'It hath been formerly judged that the domestic servants of the King of Heaven should be of the noblest families on earth; and though the iniquity of the late times have made clergymen meanly valued, and the sacred name of priest contemptible, yet I will labour to make it honourable, by consecrating all my learning, and all my poor abilities, to advance the glory of that God that gave them; knowing that I can never do too much for Him that hath done so much for me as to make me a Christian. And I will labour to be like my Saviour, by making humility lovely in the eyes of all men, and by following the merciful and meek example of my dear Jesus.'

"This was then his resolution, and the God of constancy, Who intended him for a great example of virtue, continued him in it; for within that year he was made



deacon, but the day when, or by whom, I cannot learn ; but that he was about that time made deacon is most certain ; for I find by the records of Lincoln, that he was made prebend of Layton Ecclesia, in the diocese of Lincoln, July 15, 1626, and that this prebend was given him by John, then lord bishop of that see. And now he had a fit occasion to shew that piety and bounty that was derived from his generous mother and his other memorable ancestors : and the occasion was this.

“ This Layton Ecclesia is a village near to Spalden, in the county of Huntingdon, and the greatest part of the parish church was fallen down, and that of it which stood was so decayed, so little, and so useless, that the parishioners could not meet to perform their duty to God in public prayer and praises ; and thus it had been for almost twenty years, in which time there had been some faint endeavours for a public collection to enable the parishioners to rebuild it, but with no success, till Mr. Herbert undertook it ; and he, by his own, and the contribution of many of his kindred and other noble friends, undertook the re-edification of it, and made it so much his whole business, that he became restless till he saw it finished as it now stands ; being, for the workmanship, a costly mosaic ; for the form, an exact cross ; and for the decency and beauty, I am assured it is the most remarkable parish church that this nation affords. He lived to see it so wainscoated as to be exceeded by none ; and by his order the reading-pew and pulpit were a little distant from each other, and both of an equal height ; for he would often say, ‘ They should neither have a precedency or priority of the other ; but that prayer and preaching, being equally useful, might agree like brethren, and have an equal honour and estimation.’

“ Before I proceed farther I must look back to the time of Mr. Herbert’s being made prebend, and tell the

reader, that not long after, his mother being informed of his intentions to rebuild that church, and apprehending the great trouble and charge that he was like to draw upon himself, his relations, and friends, before it could be finished, sent for him from London to Chelsea, (where she then dwelt,) and at his coming, said:— ‘George, I sent for you, to persuade you to commit simony, by giving your patron as good a gift as he has given to you; namely, that you give him back his prebend; for, George, it is not for your weak body and empty purse to undertake to build churches.’ Of which he desired he might have a day’s time to consider, and then made her an answer. And at his return to her the next day, when he had first desired her blessing, and she had given it him, his next request was, ‘That she would, at the age of thirty-three years, allow him to become an undutiful son, for he had made a vow to God, that if he were able he would rebuild that church.’ And then shewed her such reasons for his resolution, that she presently subscribed to be one of his benefactors, and undertook to solicit William, Earl of Pembroke, to become another, who subscribed for fifty pounds; and not long after, by a witty and persuasive letter from Mr. Herbert, made it fifty pounds more.”

About 1629 he was seized with a quotidian ague, which obliged him to remove to Woodford, in Essex, for change of air; and when, after his ague had abated, some consumptive appearances were apprehended, he went to Dauntsey, in Wiltshire, the seat of Lord Danvers, Earl of Danby. He afterwards married Jane Danvers, daughter of Mr. Charles Danvers, of Bainton, in Wiltshire. About three months after his marriage, Dr. Curle, who was then rector of Bemerton, in Wiltshire, was made Bishop of Bath and Wells, (and not long after translated to Winchester,) and by that means the presentation of a clerk to Bemerton did not fall to the Earl



of Pembroke, (who was the undoubted patron of it,) but to the king, by reason of Dr. Curle's advancement; but Philip, then Earl of Pembroke, (for William was lately dead,) requested the king to bestow it upon his kinsman George Herbert; and the king said, "Most willingly to Mr. Herbert, if it be worth his acceptance:" and the earl as willingly and suddenly sent it to him, without seeking. But though Mr. Herbert had put on a resolution for the clergy, yet, at receiving this presentation, the apprehension of the last great account that he was to make for the cure of so many souls made him fast and pray often, and consider for not less than a month; in which time he had some resolutions to decline both the priesthood and that living. And in this time of considering, "He endured" (as he would often say) "such spiritual conflicts as none can think but only those that have endured them."

In the midst of these conflicts, his old and dear friend Mr. Arthur Woodnot, took a journey to salute him at Bainton (where he then was with his wife's friends and relations) and was joyful to be an eye witness of his health, and happy marriage. And after they had rejoiced together some few days, they took journey to Wilton, the famous seat of the Earls of Pembroke; at which time, the king, the earl, and the whole court were there, or at Salisbury, which is near to it. And at this time Mr. Herbert presented his thanks to the earl, for his presentation to Bemerton, but had not yet resolved to accept it, and told him the reason why; but that night, the earl acquainted Dr. Laud, then Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, with his kinsman's irresolution. And the bishop did the next day so convince Mr. Herbert, that the refusal of it was a sin; that a tailor was sent for to come speedily from Salisbury to Wilton, to take measure, and make his

canonical clothes, against next day: which the tailor did; and Mr. Herbert being so habited, went with his presentation to the learned Dr. Davenant, who was then Bishop of Salisbury, and he gave him institution immediately (for Mr. Herbert had been made deacon some years before) and he was also the same day (which was April 26th, 1630,) inducted into the good and more pleasant, than healthful parsonage of Bemerton: which is a mile from Salisbury.

Here he passed the remainder of his days, discharging the duties of a parish priest in a manner so exemplary, that the history of his life here, as given by Walton, or perhaps as delineated by himself in his *Country Parson*, may justly be recommended as a model.

“ He was accustomed to appear constantly with his wife, and three nieces (the daughters of a deceased sister) and his whole family, twice every day at the Church prayers, in the chapel which does almost join to his parsonage-house. And for the time of his appearing, it was strictly at the canonical hours of ten and four; and then, and there he lifted up pure and charitable hands to God in the midst of the congregation. And he would joy to have spent that time in that place, where the honour of his Master Jesus dwelleth; and there, by that inward devotion which he testified constantly by an humble behaviour, and visible adoration, he like Joshua brought not only *his own household thus to serve the Lord*; but brought most of his parishioners, and many gentlemen in the neighbourhood, constantly to make a part of his congregation twice a day; and some of the meaner sort of his parish, did so love and reverence Mr. Herbert, that they would let their plough rest when Mr. Herbert’s saint-bell rung to prayers, that they might also offer their devotions to God with him; and would return back to their plough. And his most holy life was such, that it begot such reverence to God, and to him, that they



thought themselves the happier, when they carried Mr. Herbert's blessing back with them to their labour.—Thus powerful was his reason, and example, to persuade others to a practical piety and devotion.

“And his constant public prayers did never make him to neglect his own private devotions, nor those prayers that he thought himself bound to perform with his family, which always were a set form, and not long; and he did always conclude them with that collect which the Church hath appointed for the day or week.—Thus he made every day's sanctity a step towards that kingdom where impurity cannot enter.

“His chiefest recreation was music, in which heavenly art he was a most excellent master, and, did himself compose many divine hymns and anthems, which he set and sung to his lute or viol; and, though he was a lover of retiredness, yet his love to music was such, that he went usually twice every week on certain appointed days, to the cathedral church in Salisbury; and at his return would say, ‘That his time spent in prayer, and cathedral music, elevated his soul, and was his heaven upon earth.’ But before his return thence to Bemerton, he would usually sing and play his part, at an appointed private music meeting; and, to justify this practice, he would often say, ‘Religion does not banish mirth, but only moderates, and sets rules to it.’”

Unhappily, however, for his flock, his life was shortened by a return of the consumptive symptoms which had formerly appeared, and he died in February 1632. He published, *Oratio qua auspicatissimum sereniss. Princ. Caroli reditum ex Hispaniis celebravit G. H. Acad. Cantab. Orator*; a translation of Cornaro *On Temperance*; Herbert's Remains—in this volume is his *Priest to the Temple, or the Country Parson's Character and Rule of Holy Life*; *The Temple, Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations*. This has been often reprinted.—*Walton*.

## HERMAS.

HERMAS, sometimes called The Pastor, or Shepherd, from the title of a book which bears his name, is by some ranked among the Apostolical Fathers. Many are of opinion that he was the disciple of St. Paul, of whom mention is made in Romans xvi. 14; and in that opinion they are supported by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. Others have maintained that he was the same person with one Hermes, brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, who flourished about the year 141. The Pastor, or Shepherd, of Hermas, is a book concerning the antiquity and genuineness of which there is abundant evidence. It was received in many ancient churches as canonical, and Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and even Tertullian, before he became a Montanist, quoted it, as a part of the inspired writings; but it was rejected by other churches, and placed among the apocryphal books; and Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, and Ruffinus, concurred in that judgment, while they allowed that it was, notwithstanding, a work of great merit, which might be useful for the instruction of Christians. It is divided into three books: the first contains four visions, in which a female, representing the Church, gives directions concerning the Church and the conduct of Christians. The second, twelve precepts, inculcating various moral virtues, and these Hermas feigns to be delivered to him by his guardian angel. The third, ten similitudes, recommending a christian spirit and practice. The Pastor was originally written in Greek; but we have now only an ancient Latin version of it, excepting some fragments preserved in the ancient Greek authors who have quoted it. The best edition of it is that which appears in Cotelierius's SS. Pat. Opera, with the Notes of Le Clerc, published in 1698. Archbishop Wake published an English translation of it in his version of The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers, 1710.—*Wake. Lardner.*



## HERMOGENES.

HERMOGENES, a heretic of the second century, was a native of Africa, a painter, and Stoic philosopher. He held that matter was the first principle, and made Idea the mother of all the elements; for which reason his followers were called Materiarians. By his assertion of the self-existence of matter, he endeavoured to give an account (as the Stoic philosophers had done before him) of the origin of evil. His followers denied the resurrection, rejected water baptism, asserted that angels were composed of fire and spirit, and were the creators of the soul of man; and that Christ, as He ascended, divested Himself of human nature, and left His body in the sun. Tertullian has written against him. He never set up a separate communion. No writings of Hermogenes are extant.—*Cave. Lardner.*

## HERRING, THOMAS.

THOMAS HERRING, was born in 1691, at Walsoken, in Norfolk, of which parish his father was rector. He was educated in the school at Wisbeach, and removed from thence to Jesus College, Cambridge; but, in 1716, he became fellow of Corpus Christi College. On entering into orders, he obtained successively the livings of great Shelford, Stow cum Qui, and Trinity in Cambridge. In 1722 Bishop Fleetwood made him his chaplain, and gave him the rectory of Rettenden, in Essex, and that of Barclay, in Hertfordshire. After this he was chosen preacher to the society of Lincoln's Inn, and appointed chaplain in ordinary to the king; on which he took his degree of doctor in divinity. In 1731 he was presented to the rectory of Blechingley, in Surrey, and the same year was advanced to the deanery of Rochester. In

1737 he was made Bishop of Bangor; and in 1743 translated to York, where he exerted himself so much in rousing the county in favour of the Hanoverian party, that he was styled facetiously the red Herring, and in 1747 he was translated to Canterbury. He died March 13, 1757, and was buried at Croydon. In 1763 a volume of his sermons was published, and was followed in 1777 by a collection of his letters.—*Biog. Brit.*

## HERVEY, JAMES.

JAMES HERVEY was born at Hardingstone, near Northampton, in 1713-4, and was sent by his father, who held the living of Collingtree in that neighbourhood, to the free grammar school of Northampton, whence he was removed at the age of seventeen to Lincoln College, Oxford. He remained at the university five or six years, without proceeding farther than his bachelor's degree, and having taken orders retired, in 1736, to the curacy of Dummer, in Hampshire. In 1738 he quitted Dummer to reside at Stoke Abbey, in Devonshire, the seat of his friend, Paul Orchard, Esq., and in 1738 undertook the curacy of Bideford, in the same county, where he was greatly beloved by his congregation, who increased his small stipend by a voluntary collection. It was during his residence in Devonshire that he planned, and probably wrote, part of his "Meditations;" and an excursion to Kilhampton, in Cornwall, occasioned him to lay the scene of his Meditations among the tombs in the church of that place. After serving the cure of Bideford nearly three years his rector died, and the new incumbent dismissed him, although the parishioners offered to maintain him at their own expense. In 1743 he became curate to his father, then possessing the living of Weston Favell, and on the death of the latter he succeeded him in his livings, both of Weston and Colling-



tree. He attended the duty in each of these parishes alternately with a curate, with the most exemplary assiduity, holding a weekly lecture, in addition to the regular service, until his great exertions, both in the study and pulpit, brought on a decline, which terminated his existence on Christmas day, 1758, in the forty-fifth year of his age.

He wrote,—Meditations and Contemplations, containing Meditations among the Tombs, Reflections on a Flower-garden, and a Descant on Creation ; Contemplations on the Night and Starry Heavens, and a Winter Piece, (both of these were turned into blank verse, in imitation of Young's Night Thoughts, by Mr. Newcomb ;) Remarks on Lord Bolingbroke's Letters on the Study and Use of History, so far as they relate to the History of the Old Testament, &c., in a letter to a lady of quality, 1753, 8vo. ; Theron and Aspasio, or a Series of Dialogues and Letters on the most important subjects, 1755, 3 vols, 8vo, (some of the principal points which he endeavours to illustrate in this work, are, the beauty and excellence of the Scriptures, the ruin and depravity of human nature, its happy recovery founded on the Atonement, and effected by the Spirit of Christ ; but the chief article is, the imputed righteousness of Christ ; his notion of which was attacked by several writers ;) Sermons, the third edition published after his death, 1759 ; an edition of Jenks's Meditations, 1757, with a recommendatory preface ; a recommendatory preface to Burnham's Pious Memorials, published in 1753, 8vo : Eleven letters to Wesley ; Letters to Lady Francis Shirley. All these are included in the edition of his works, 6 vols. 8vo. printed for Messrs. Rivington. In 1811 appeared, for the first time, what may be considered as a seventh volume entitled, Letters elegant, interesting, and evangelical, illustrative of the authors amiable character, and many circumstances of his early history not generally known.—*Life prefixed to his works.*

## HESHUSIUS, TILLEMANNUS.

TILLEMANNUS. HESHUSIUS, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Wesel in the Duchy of Cleves, in 1526. He was appointed early in life professor of divinity at Heidelberg, and also preacher in the church of the Holy Ghost. While discharging the duties of these offices, he became involved in a violent contest with William Clebicius, on the subject of the eucharist. His opinions led to his banishment from the palatinate, and he retired into Saxony, where he employed himself in opposing the progress of Calvinism in Germany, by different writings which he published at Jena, whence he was expelled in 1573. Afterwards he was appointed professor of theology at Konigsberg. Here he taught till 1577, and was appointed Bishop of Samia; but having, in a treatise written against Beza, advanced the position, that "the flesh of Jesus Christ, in *abstracto*, is adorable," he was accused before a synod of maintaining a dangerous proposition, and was ordered to retract it. This he refused to do, and was banished the country. He retired to Lubeck, and afterwards to Helmstadt, where he was appointed professor of divinity. Though he was a zealous Lutheran, yet he dissented from the doctrine of the most rigid of his party concerning the *ubiquity* or *omnipresence* of Christ's person, considered as a *man*, and was the principal conductor of the opposition to that notion at the famous conference at Quedlinburg in 1583. He died at Helmstadt in 1588. He wrote, Commentaries on the Psalms, on Isaiah, and on the Epistles of St. Paul; A Treatise on the Lord's Supper, and on Justification; Sexcenti Errores pleni Blasphemiis in Deum, quos Romana Pontificiaque Ecclesia contra Dei Verbum Furenter defendit; Assertio Testamenti Jesu Christi contra Blasphemias Calvinistarum; and other pieces.—*New Biog. Dict.*



## HEYLIN, PETER.

PETER HEYLIN was born at Burford, in Oxfordshire, in the year 1600. When in his fourteenth year, he was entered a commoner of Hart Hall, in Oxford, having, whilst at school at Burford, evinced a mental capacity above the ordinary class. "In trivials," says Wood, "he profited to a miracle, especially in poetry." So highly esteemed indeed were his talents and acquirements, that before he attained his sixteenth year he was chosen a demy of Magdalen College. Before he reached his nineteenth year he had concocted certain lucubrations on the subject of cosmography, into which he had entered with so great energy and research, that he was permitted and encouraged to give lectures in college upon that intricate and interesting science. In this undertaking he acquitted himself with such high honour and reputation, that with little difficulty or delay he acquired the advantage and distinction of a fellowship at Magdalen. But it was a vigorous stretch of mind in one of such early years, to grasp at so comprehensive and multifarious a subject; a subject which, from its very nature, embraces matters of peculiar science and research: such as geology, botany, meteorology, agriculture, geography, and many others, enough to employ, as in these present days is the case, the laborious studies of distinct philosophers and professors. One of these branches of his cosmography Heylin indeed did dilate upon in a separate publication, namely, geography, but under the title of "Microcosmus." On this head he committed a volume to the press, and dedicated it to Prince Charles, afterwards Charles I. In two or three years this work attained a second edition, an event which, though flattering to Heylin's reputation, was near costing him the loss

of that royal favour and patronage which at first seemed so likely to distinguish him. A copy of this second edition was presented to the king, James I., by Dr. Young, dean of Winchester. But the scrutinizing eye of the monarch, though at first much pleased with the work, alighted upon an unfortunate, or at least an imperfect passage, which described England as a country and a monarchy inferior to France. James was gravely offended at this, and in his wrath he ordered the lord keeper to suppress the book: a great shock this to Heylin, who lost no time to repair the sad transgression. He betook himself to Prince Charles as his friend and patron, who advised him to send in writing an explanation of the peccant passage to the dean of Winchester, to be laid before the king. This explanation was satisfactory, and the king was appeased. It set forth that it was a typographical error in the passage which had caused all the mischief:—the word “*is*” was printed for “*was*,” thus making it appear that England, even with the augmentation of Scotland, *is now*, instead of *was*, inferior to France before such augmentation. Great monarchs—great in regard to the magnitude, power, and intelligence of their dominions—can sometimes show very petty pride; and this was one of James’s weaknesses, as they who know well his history and character, or even look at this almost insignificant occurrence, will readily admit.

The year before this second edition of his *Microcosmus* came out, Heylin, then just turned twenty-three years of age, was ordained by Dr. Howson, Bishop of Oxford.

In some two or three years after his ordination, he undertook an academical exercise, in Oxford, under Dr. Prideaux, the regius professor of divinity. The questions propounded to him by Prideaux were, *An Ecclesia unquam fuerit invisibilis?*—*An Ecclesia possit errare?* Here was, of course, an opportunity for Heylin to show his bias, whatever it might be. If he argued



for the entire invisibility of the Church, and the possibility of her falling into error, the Puritans, with the regius professor among them—for that was *his* bias—would claim him for their own. If he argued contrariwise, they would be offended, and perhaps upbraid him with having an affection for Popery. He adopted, however, the latter argument, not from any love of Rome, with which he had no sympathy, but from clear, sound, orthodox convictions of apostolic truth. His argument therefore was, for the infallibility of the Church Catholic, and not of the Church of Rome; and thus, he did not aim to please a *party*, but simply to maintain sound doctrine. Perhaps he might have expected some heavy discharges of censure and contradiction from Dr. Prideaux and his particular school. If he did, he was not taken by surprise by the rough usage he received from the learned professor. He “fell foul upon Heylin,” as Anthony Wood tells us, “calling him ‘Bellarminian, Pontifician,’ and what not; doing his best to beat Heylin from the ground he had rested on,—but Peter was not to be so easily frightened. He bravely fought the battle of orthodoxy against sectarianism; and though again and again on this present occasion assailed with reproaches of being a Papist, he set them all at defiance, knowing well the fallacy of such an imputation, and feeling, as he said, that ‘God stood with him.’”

The storm continued in the university for several months. Many of the most influential among the Puritan party unceasingly attacked him, in open pulpit as well as in academical exercise; Heylin himself being occasionally an auditor of his own assailants, but he always, with great resolution, said that, although it much disturbed and perplexed his mind to be looked upon as friendly to Popery, yet he was but very little troubled by the opposition, which the puritanical preachers and declaimers had raised against his arguments on the academical questions. His fame, as a zealous, intelli-

gent, and very able friend to the reformed and apostolical Church, was highly and honourably advanced by this display of his abilities at Oxford; and on being called upon to preach before the king, he very fitly took hold of the occasion, preaching on the text, John iv. 20, to set himself right under the imputation, which his enemies had so industriously cast upon him, of having an affection for the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome.

This honourable and honest desire was not a vain one. He more than ever proved himself a faithful and unmixed friend of the Church of England, equally unbiassed towards both Romish errors, and puritanical extremes. Such a man could not long be hid, or unnoticed by the supporters of orthodoxy. His reputation soon reached the ears of Laud, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, to whom, through the intervention of Danvers, Earl of Danby, he was personally introduced. From this introduction arose an intimacy, and an attachment between the two congenial spirits, which afterwards resulted in very peculiar advantages to each of them, as will be shown in the subsequent pages. Laud, as might be expected, would take much delight in an association with one, who, to eminent learning and brilliant capacity, added a spirit so akin to his own, and sentiments on Church matters so clearly orthodox and apostolical. We therefore find Heylin, soon after this introduction, entering into animated discourse, with his new episcopal friend, on the subject of the late academical exercise at Oxford, together with the side which Heylin himself took, and the part which Dr. Prideaux and his party took against him. The arguments and grounds taken up by the young graduate were entirely approved by the bishop, who added that they were such as all the Prideauxs in the world could never upset in any fair way: "Don't be discouraged by noise and clamour," said Laud; "I was formerly" continued he, "assailed in the same way, and on a similar occasion, and after taking my

ground upon similar views, as yours; but I cared not for the clamour which arose against me, though Archbishop Abbot at that time was at the head of it. I quietly, but firmly, stood my ground, and at length overcame my assailants, as you by the same course, may also do it. "Keep in the *via media*," continued Laud, "and by your judicious moderation, avoid the extremes of party, whether it proceed from Rome or Geneva, and thus you may employ yourself in making up the breaches in the walks of Christendom." No admonition could be more wise or judicious than this; for Heylin's temper was hot, and somewhat overbearing. He wanted forbearance and patience towards his opponents. Heylin now (in 1628) became chaplain to his friend Lord Danby, and accompanied him in that capacity to the isle of Guernsey, of which his lordship was then made governor. But the retirement and privacy of that position not well suiting the young chaplain's views, he soon returned to England, and threw together, in his leisure hours, a short but entertaining account of the island above-named, and his voyage to it. The subject was not one possessing much interest, and therefore to give it the more consequence he committed the MS. to his friend Laud, then Bishop of London, who shrunk not from bestowing his patronage upon it; though many years elapsed before it was really laid before the public eye. After this "he fell into a resolution to effect the history of St. George, patron of the most noble order of the garter." He had previously, through the interest of his friend Lord Danby, been appointed one of the king's chaplains. Through Laud, he was now personally introduced to the king, and was soon made to understand the high approbation with which his book had been received by his majesty. This chivalric history had not been a sinecure or off-hand work with Heylin. Very great researches into various



intricate documents had been bestowed upon it, whilst much public prejudice, especially from the Puritan school of religionists, which was extending its principles and influence very widely among the people, was already at work against it. In fact, the history of St. George cost Heylin the study and labour of many months. But the old, or at least the wholesome maxim at length prevailed with him, viz: "First toil, then victory." The toil indeed seems to have been not merely that of literary research and study, but the enduring and contending against the calumnies and assaults of sectarian enemies. However strengthening and encouraging might be the countenance of royal favour, and the patronage of many persons of high consideration, yet in the puritanical Archbishop of Canterbury, (Abbot,) and in the Earl of Exeter, (William Cecil,) Heylin, in regard to this book of his about St. George and the order of the garter, met with two formidable enemies. Abbot was never backward to thwart the labours of sound and strenuous Churchmen, and his opposition therefore it is not difficult to account for. Lord Exeter (the second earl) took also at first a very harsh and uncourteous part against Heylin on this occasion; the whole of his lordship's bitterness arising from the idea, that the author of "the life of St. George" was a bragging charlatan in literature, ("a begging scholar," as Lord Exeter called him,) whose only object was to beg his way to eminence and preferment by a display of his scholarship. But the noble calumniator was soon silenced; and not only silenced, but made also to be ashamed of his vituperation, by the sterling weight and worth of Heylin's literary acquirements, and the high patronage which, out of consideration for them, was now so deservedly growing upon him. His Puritan enemies were generally very determined against him, but in learning and in argument he was so greatly their superior, that in all

his encounters with them, they always had the worst of it.

There was a Dr. George Hakewill, who had undertaken to demolish all Heylin's arguments, and history too, about St. George and the garter knighthood. But unfortunately for this adversary, he dealt out his vituperations upon Heylin, with so unsparing a hand, attacking not merely the book itself, but the personal character of the author of it, in both his civil and religious capacity, that great interest about him was awakened in the breast of the king himself; and this led to a step, which resulted in still higher reputation for Heylin, as the author of the biography of St. George. The king commanded Heylin to repair to Windsor, for the purpose of searching more diligently into records concerning the order of the garter. These researches brought to light many additional facts and arguments, which served only to establish the more incontestably what Heylin had previously written on the subject. A fresh edition of his book was soon called for, Dr. Hakewill retracted his observations concerning the statements in the former edition, refrained from a repetition of his slanders, and thus helped to bring about the very purpose which at first he laboured so sedulously to discomfit. He threw oil upon the fire, when he thought he was throwing water; and of course the honour and reputation of Heylin's name, as an author, a scholar, and a divine, shone out with more brilliancy than before.

He still kept his position in the university of Oxford, as an able and learned divine, and about the same time, when at length he resigned his fellowship, (1630) he was appointed to preach on Act Sunday, at St. Mary's. On this occasion he again manifested not only an intrepid spirit, as a friend to the Church of England, but a most able competency as an advocate of her apostolical truth and order, and a vigilant guardian of her rights and con-

stitution. The circumstance which at this particular period called forth more than his usual energies, was this:—certain Puritan divines of weight and influence among their fellows, and resolutely desirous of extending their own sectarian views more widely over the kingdom, had concocted a scheme, and formed themselves into a corporation, for buying up all impropriations of the Church, in order that they might thereby become the sole patrons of such livings, and consequently introduce into them such ministers or lecturers as would oppose themselves to the established Church, and advocate principles and doctrines at variance with her sound apostolical theology. The scheme was of a most plausible and specious character, peculiarly alluring to many piously disposed but indiscriminating persons, who were caught by any proposition which seemed to have religion for its object. But what is plausible is not always sound or trustworthy. Mischief may be deeply concealed under a garb of show. Heylin was too sagacious to be blind to all this peril, to which this new scheme would expose the Church; and he was too determined a champion in her cause to lose an opportunity of defending her. Taking therefore for his text on Act Sunday, Matt. xiii. 25, “While men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way,” he boldly reminded the Church’s friends, many of whom, as well as of the Puritan party, were among his congregation,—of the “knavery of the scheme;” and thus, while some raised a great clamour against him, and suggested certain heavy inflictions to be dealt out to one, who had so ungraciously and unsparingly opposed a godly project, the eyes of others were opened by his arguments, and the scheme lost thereby no small portion of its friends. Amidst all this contention, with threats, revenge, and disappointment on one side, and acclamations and encouragement on the other, Heylin again resorted to his able friend Laud. He submitted his sermon to the bishop’s hands,



—Laud being then Bishop of London and chancellor of the university of Oxford,—and was soon rewarded by the honour and gratification of the bishop's entire approval. Even the king himself, (James I.) awakened by the noisy discussion of the business, had taken some share in its progress, and expressed himself with favour towards Heylin for his persevering and provident exposure of "an iniquitous scheme to undo the Church."

Heylin's academical progress pursued its way with all due and desirable facility; and his ecclesiastical advancement had already commenced under a peculiar indication of favour from the king. No sooner had he triumphed over his enemy, Dr. Hakewill, and thus advanced himself in the good graces of James, than he was presented to a prebendal stall in Westminster, and to the living of Houghton-le-Spring in the diocese of Durham. But men who, like Heylin, stand prominently and actively forward in the espousal of any cause, whether righteous or unrighteous, must needs encounter the wrath and contradictions of others pursuing opposite views. Jealousies too, and even aversions, will sometimes arise between such antagonist parties, however pious and upright may be their respective characters. In this ill-favoured position was Heylin placed by his prebendal preferment, in regard to Dr. Williams, the then dean of Westminster.

Williams and Laud, two men of unquestionable piety, and of zeal also in the cause of the Church's welfare, never well understood each other. Envy and jealousy, arising from various causes, took the place of charity and confidence between them. Williams looked upon Laud as too punctilious in his requirements of discipline and externals; and the latter regarded the former as too heedless of such things, and as too much disposed to favour the Puritans. Each had his partizans, and Heylin being the devoted friend of Laud, and even richly endowed with a kindred spirit, became, by his new association

with the installed dignitaries of Westminster, an object of anything but esteem or delight in the eyes of the dean. Bickerings and controversies frequently took place between them, by pamphlets and other writings, as well as by personal collision. Heylin, from pragmatical conceit of understanding, and an irrepressible fierceness of spirit, was sometimes contumacious; whilst the dean was as often disposed to thwart, or act superciliously to Heylin. Each suffered, in his turn, no small inconvenience from the other's malevolence. But Heylin, as the fast and constant friend of Laud, happened to belong to the party at that time in the ascendant. It therefore was not altogether a meritorious or virtuous triumph to him, that in spite of the dean's enmity, he should still find himself advancing in professional reputation, honour, and emolument. The king and Bishop Laud were decidedly Heylin's patrons, and as they were now carrying Church matters with rather a high hand, their advancement of Heylin was not un-mixed with spite towards Williams. Williams fell under the displeasure of both, got into much trouble, even to imprisonment, and consequently *his* triumph was the triumph of suffering for conscience sake, or perhaps the triumph of weakness suffering compulsion from the arm of power. Whilst Bishop Williams remained thus suspended and removed from his official charges at Westminster, Heylin was still pushing forward his way in reputation and emolument. His royal patron, Charles I., still looked towards him with a favourable countenance, and induced him, in order to keep him more constantly within call of the court, to exchange his northern living of Houghon, in the county of Durham, for another much nearer to London, viz: Alresford in Hampshire.

"Being now shipped, and in hopes of a good wind," as Wood quaintly enough describes Heylin's promising position and prospects, he proceeded to his legitimate

advancement in academical honours. He went to Oxford for his degree of D.D., and this opened to him an occasion for another display of his theological acquirements, his stedfastness in apostolical doctrine, and his sound affection towards the reformed Church of England. His old enemy or opponent, Professor Prideaux placed before him for his academical exercise, the three following questions :—1st. Whether the Church hath authority in determining controversies of faith? 2nd. Whether the Church hath authority in interpreting the Sacred Scriptures? 3rd. Whether the Church hath authority in appointing rites and ceremonies? It might be expected that Heylin and Prideaux would be widely at issue on such points as these. The former as a faithful son of the Church, would honestly speak the voice of the Church, and declare his entire affirmation of the three questions. The latter, as a more biased Puritan, would not admit them. The discussion was a warm one. It was in vain for Heylin to urge the authority of the 20th article of the Church of England, which plainly, positively, and unequivocally maintained the same position. Prideaux and his partizans persisted in making light of such a testimony, and in his vehemence to invalidate the argument set forth in that article, as well as its authority, he so far lost himself as to assert that the Church was a mere chimera, that it could not therefore determine with certainty anything, and that it were better to refer controversies to the determination of the learned in the universities, than to the Church, or the bishops.

The king, who seems always to have taken a lively interest in Heylin's welfare, was by him made fully acquainted with all the particulars of this academical conflict. Both his majesty, and Laud, the chancellor of Oxford university, to whom indeed, both Heylin's arguments, and Prideaux's chimerical rejoinder, had been submitted, took full and very angry cognizance of the professor's



heterodoxical vagaries. Remonstrances of a severe nature from those high authorities were presented to him ; nor indeed did he escape from the marked and somewhat unmeasured censure of many of those learned and orthodox ministers of the Church, who were actual hearers of his unsound opinions. From this dilemma he seems not to have gone quite the way to emancipate himself. In his wrath against Heylin, for being so instrumental in procuring the king's and Laud's remonstrance against him, he made a pretence, that had not "his mouth been shut up by authority," he would still have maintained the soundness of his own suggestions, however "chimerical" they might seem to others ; and so finding himself thus restrained, he concocted and printed a statement, of a personal and invective nature, against Heylin, hoping thereby to depress him in the king's favour. This was a step unworthy of such a man as Professor Prideaux ; a man of high and deserved reputation for piety, and theological learning, exceedingly respected in the university for his benevolent and courteous character. Heylin, however, though occupying the high ground of orthodoxy in the controversy, and standing in a distinguished position for learning and ability, had yet that arrogance of spirit, which might perhaps have led him to assume an unseemly and disrespectful air towards the regius professor. This was not likely to enforce a spirit of forbearance or of charity into the controversy. It would separate the parties into something more than mere combatants for truth. It would kindle, as indeed it did, a personal jealousy and variance between them. And while we may condemn the uncharitable asperity with which Prideaux afterwards wrote about Heylin, and the unworthy steps he took to depreciate him in the estimation of the king, yet we cannot let Heylin himself escape from the charge of inflicting upon his antagonist a fierce and aggravating retaliation. No wonder this, when we consider Heylin's haughty temper. Able theo-

logians, or the most zealous friends of the Church, are not angels incarnate, and therefore the weakness of the natural man will sometimes prevail over their higher and holier principles.

About this time, 1633, arose between the two contending parties in the Church, the question about the fittest way of observing the Lord's day. The Puritan urged the necessity of a morose and uncompromising strictness of practice and demeanour, on that sacred festival. The high Church and the court encouraged a principle directly the reverse of this. The king was advised to re-issue a certain declaration made some years previously by James I., encouraging the people to employ the evenings or other leisure hours of the Lord's day in certain sports and recreations. This measure was advocated also by many influential and powerful writers: among whom was Heylin, who published a History of the Sabbath, a learned and important work. However angry the more serious and Puritan party might be with Heylin's book, yet the king was delighted with it; and testified his pleasure, as well as his partiality towards the author, by much personal notice of him.

Heylin's old antagonist, Williams, being now suspended from the office of Treasurer of the Church or Abbey of Westminster, Heylin was elected to that office, receiving also with it, the living of Islip, in Oxfordshire, and in a year after (1640) the office of clerk of the college at Westminster, to represent them in convocation. A more fit choice for this last-named office could not well have been made, except perhaps in respect to personal temper and demeanour. While a thorough acquaintance with all the rights, constitution, and doctrines of the Church, accompanied by sound Church affections, and habits of business, would be valuable qualifications in Heylin for taking an active and influential part in such an assembly as convocation, yet the

want of a patient and conciliating spirit might deeply mar much of the good to be derived from it.

Heylin indeed was never free from this contumacious turn of mind, and such was the tempestuous fury and vehemence of the Church's enemies in his day, that with his peculiar temper he could not well pursue a life of peace and safety. But little is told us of his achievements in convocation. He could indeed find but very circumscribed opportunity for work in that assembly, on account of the peculiar state of the public mind at that period. The Church's enemies were rising rapidly towards the ascendant in the nation, and the convocation was but of short standing, the people also beginning to look upon it with suspicion and contempt. About this time Heylin was preaching in Westminster Abbey before his antagonist, Bishop Williams, (dean also, as before observed, of Westminster) and urged the argument, that "people were then too much determined to follow their own opinions rather than conform to the voice of the Church,—that they cared not what became of the Church, so as they could but carry out their own devices,—that such stubborn pride it was, which had caused so many quarrels and schisms in the Church, the people preferring to throw all into open tumult, rather than conform to the lawful government of the Church, derived from Christ and His apostles to these very times. The argument here propounded might be sound, but it was sternly and wrathfully urged, and, as Heylin must well have known, was calculated more to irritate his Puritan hearers, and especially his Puritan dean, than to make peace, or to heal the divisions he was condemning. The dean at length interfered in the very midst of Heylin's sermon:—"No more on that point, Peter! no more on that point!" said the dean in an audible voice. But Heylin was not so easily to be put down. "I have a little more to say, my lord, and then I have done," said he, and he proceeded, nothing daunted, in the same



strain of side-wind reproach against the puritanical predilections and passions of the times. The breach between parties, and especially between the two *personal* parties, Bishop Williams and Dr. Heylin, was of course enlarged by this unmitigated and unconciliating discourse of the latter, however he might himself have hoped thereby, and perhaps meant, to have awakened a different result. The bishop too, was equally reprehensible for so unbecoming an interference, not less than for discountenancing opinions, whose soundness at least he should have respected, however he might lament their being so unseasonably and so irritatingly declared. The affair made a great stir among both the friends and the enemies of the Church; but when Heylin was brought before the committee of the courts of justice for other incidental charges by the Puritan party, it was openly confessed by the commissioners that "Heylin had said nothing but what an honest man might say, and a good christian might hear; and that the bishop was transported beyond his bounds, and failed in his accustomed prudence."

The Puritan schism was now triumphing over the ruins of the Church. Her enemies had now assumed the reins of government, and her friends were every where treated with scorn and oppression. Prynne was released from his exile, the penalty he had for several years been suffering, for certain atrocious libels against Church and monarchy, especially one publication, called *Histrio Mastix*. Prynne therefore now, with his accustomed virulence and revenge, seeing his Puritan friends in power, and his enemies in subjugation, turned the tables upon them whenever an opportunity presented itself. Peter Heylin came in for copious out-pourings of Prynne's practical revenge. Heylin had been a most active instrument against Prynne in searching out the many offensive passages in the *Histrio Mastix*, which brought the latter under so heavy an infliction of punishment. He now, in his turn, hunted the little pragmati-

cal doctor down, by procuring his citation before the committee for the courts of justice; and there openly accusing him, "as the chief agent and contriver of Prynne's suffering." Enough, however, of equitable discrimination was yet maintained by this committee to enable them to see, that no very heavy delinquency could for that reason lodge upon Heylin. The committee, therefore, after hearing the case with ingenuous patience, soon disposed of the charge, and dismissed the doctor without any censure. But the mob out of doors, the popular and impetuous backers of the revolutionary Prynne, treated the loyal and orthodox doctor with less courtesy. No sooner had he made his appearance, by virtue of his acquittal, beyond the doors of the court, than he was assailed by rude and vehement abuse from the populace. Neither personal assault and violence, nor vulgar revilings, were spared towards him. And among many other insults of this nature, some coarse, impudent voice upbraided him, as a mere scribbler in divinity, and better fitted to write on geography.

Shafts of insult, thrown out with malicious vehemence, whilst they may wound the object, sometimes also awaken new and wholesome thoughts within him. And so it now was with Heylin. The rough and uncereemonious hint he had received, respecting his former and almost forgotten publication of cosmography, in comparison with his writings on divinity, stirred up within him the notion, not that he was more fit to handle the former than the latter subject, but that at least his *Microcosmus* was a work of renown, and therefore that a fresh and enlarged edition of it might be well received by the public, and a profitable speculation to himself. This new thought was not an evanescent one. The rebellious complexion of the times had now upset both Church and monarchy, and Heylin, in common with a vast number of his brethren, was deprived of his preferments, and driven to seek subsistence, as best he could.

In this dilemma, he found his literary attainments and reputation of material service to him. Accordingly, he betook himself "to the earning of money by writing books;" nor was the hint, so roughly conveyed to him by the noisy street orator just alluded to, about the *Microcosmus*, forgotten. A new and much enlarged edition of it was now again put forth, and with considerable advantage to the coffers of its author. But Heylin nevertheless, had, by the unsparing malice of his now ascendant enemies, a heavy load of worldly trouble to contend against. His royal patron, and his episcopal patron, (Laud,) were both of them in a state of little less than subjugation; and he himself was an impoverished wanderer. He was voted a "delinquent" by the rebellious parliament, and, under the same savage authority, had to suffer the sequestration of all his property, his goods and chattels, and even the valuable library he had for so many years possessed and valued.

His last resource was to join the king at Oxford; and here for a time he found employment. The king had commanded him to take the editorship of a periodical paper then publishing at Oxford, and of course devoted to the loyal cause. It was called "*Mercurius Aulicus*," and had previously been under the management of one John Birkenhead, a most facetious wag, who had for a long time attracted many subscribers to his paper by his buffooneries. But Birkenhead, though himself a fair classical scholar, a graduate of Oxford, and a probationary fellow of All Souls, became also a great sufferer under the Puritan party, when the dominant power fell into their hands. He was driven from his fellowship, whilst his railleries and mockeries of the anti-church, and anti-monarchy portion of the nation, being too stinging to be passed silently over, led to his being compelled to relinquish his loyal and entertaining periodical. Under Heylin's editorship, however, it was for a short time longer continued, and afforded a means of subsistence



to the new and more sober-minded editor. But this was not of long duration. The troubles of the times becoming more and more oppressive to the royal cause, the king and all his party were compelled to disperse from Oxford, and all their resources and communications were interdicted or thwarted. Heylin, and his "*Mercurius Aulicus*," suffered with other persons and things; the latter, no longer supported by any patronage, was of course relinquished; whilst the former, forlorn and destitute, was driven to seek an asylum among such friends as might be in a condition to receive him. He found a home for a time at the house of his brother, Colonel Heylin, at Minster Lovell, in Oxfordshire, where he continued for six or seven years, occupying his time, partly in farming, and partly in writing several treatises, which afterwards were submitted to the press. Happy for Peter Heylin, whilst so many of his fellow loyalists, and fellow Churchmen, much his superiors too, some of them, in personal worth, position, and acquirements, were suffering great extremities of destitution and restraint under the merciless rigour of the Puritan parliament, happy for him was it, that he should find so safe a shelter at Minster Lovell, and could pursue occupations so wholesome as farming, and so interesting as literature. Heylin, moreover, had a buoyancy and loftiness of spirit, which was not disposed to sink or quail before enemies, or threatenings. He was far from ever losing sight of the high probability that the cloudy aspect of the times would in a few years all clear away, and sunshine return. However great the extremity to which the political and ecclesiastical tempest had been carried, even to the murder of the king, and the utter discomfiture of the national Church, yet in the minds of sagacious men it seemed too bad to last very long. A reaction was looked for with both patience and confidence, and Heylin, with many of his fellow sufferers, struggling alike through all their privations and trials, lived to see it. On the restoration of

Charles II., he was restored to his former preferments. This was no more than his due, but it was far from being all that he deserved, or all that he had expected. On the ground of his strenuous and unremitting exertions, through "evil report and good report," for many years in the cause of the king, and his Church,—on the ground of the favour exhibited towards him by the late monarch,—on the ground of his distinguished acquirements, as a scholar and a divine,—he might have rested something like an expectation, if not a claim, to some particular reward from the restored monarch, or the restored hierarchy. But his legitimate claims or hopes were unfortunately counteracted by certain legitimate and personal considerations which more than outweighed the other scale. He was known to be of a hot and contentious temper, proud and pragmatistical, more of an agitator, (though in a good cause) than a peace-maker; and these qualities were not to be desired at a period, and under circumstances, when so many and great heart-burnings among the people had to be softened, and so wide a field had to be cultivated with the seeds of peace and healing. Whilst his intellectual endowments, his ardent affections towards the Church, his unceasing exertions for her welfare, his theological attainments, and his loyalty, were unhesitatingly acknowledged by all, yet it was thought unfitting to patronize him further, than by restoring him to his legitimate preferments, of which he had been so unjustly deprived. With this preferment in his hands, he departed this life in 1662, and was buried near to his own stall in Westminster Abbey.

The substance of Anthony Wood's delineations of Heylin's character has been already given in the preceding pages, but it may now be interesting to see that picture as drawn in Wood's own words. That Heylin "rose no higher than sub-dean of Westminster was wonder to many, and great discontent to him and his; but the reason being manifest to those that well knew

the temper of the person, I shall forbear to make mention of that matter any further. He was a person endowed with singular gifts,—of a sharp and pregnant wit, solid and clear judgment. In his younger years, he was accounted an excellent poet, but very conceited and pragmatikal; in his elder, a better historian, a noted preacher, and a ready extemporanean speaker. He had a tenacious memory to a miracle, whereunto he added an incredible patience in study, in which he persisted when his eyesight failed him. He was a bold, undaunted man among his friends and foes, (though of very mean post and presence) and therefore by some of them, he was accounted too high and proud for the functions he professed. On all occasions he was a constant asserter of the Church's right, and the king's prerogative, either in their afflicted or prosperous state, a severe and vigorous opposer of rebels and schismatics, a despiser of envy, and in mind not at all discouraged. He wrote many books upon various subjects, containing in them many things that are not vulgar either for style or argument; and wrote also history pleasant enough, but in some things was too much a party man to be an historian, and equally an enemy to Popery and Puritanism."

He published, besides his *Microcosmus*, a *History of the Reformation in England*; *History of the Presbyterians*; *Life of Archbishop Laud*, fol.; *History of Tithes*; *History of the Sabbath*; and many other works. His *Description of the World*, from a small 8vo, originally, was swelled in subsequent editions, under the name of *Cosmography*, to a large folio.—*Barnard's Life of Heylin*. *Vernon's Life of Heylin*.

HICKES, GEORGE.

Of this distinguished non-juring bishop, we are unable to present our readers with such an account as could be



desired, for owing to the persecution the non-jurors endured, their transactions were secret, and little light has been thrown on their history by modern publications. He was born in 1642 at Newsham, in Yorkshire, and educated at the grammar-school at North Allerton, and at St. John's College, Oxford. Soon after the Restoration he removed to Magdalen College, and thence to Magdalen Hall; and in 1664 he was chosen fellow of Lincoln College. In 1666 he was admitted into orders, and became a public tutor. In 1673, being then in a bad state of health, he was advised to travel; upon which Sir George Wheeler, who had been his pupil, invited him to accompany him to France. At Paris, where he staid a considerable time, he became acquainted with Mr. Henry Justell, who in confidence told him many secret affairs, particularly that of the intended revocation of the edict of Nantes, and of a design in Holland and England to set aside the family of the Stuarts. After his return home, in May, 1675, he took his degree of B.D., and about that time became rector of St. Ebbe's, in Oxford. In 1676 he was made chaplain to the Duke of Lauderdale, whom, on his grace being appointed high-commissioner of Scotland, he accompanied thither in the capacity of chaplain in 1677. In April, 1678, he was sent up to court, with Dr. Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow, to lay before the king the proceedings in Scotland. He returned the month following, and was desired by Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, to accept the degree of D.D. in that university. In September, 1679, he married, and in December following he was created D.D. at Oxford. In March, 1680, the king promoted him to a prebend of Worcester; and in August he was presented by Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the vicarage of All-hallows, Barking, near the Tower. In December, 1681, he was made chaplain in ordinary to the king, and in August, 1683, dean of Worcester. In 1686, he left the vicarage of Barking,

and went to settle on his deanery; the Bishop of Worcester having offered him the rectory of All-church, not far from that city, which he accepted.

The bishopric of Bristol was vacant in 1684, and Dr. Hickes was thought of for that see: the king, it is reported, said, that he would not offer so small a bishopric, though if he would accept it, he would permit him to hold the deanery of Worcester, in commendam. But whether the offer were made to Dr. Hickes, or whether this was only a remark made to the Duke of Beaufort, his patron, who, on consideration, desisted from his suit, does not appear. The latter is the more probable circumstance. His prospect of future preferment in the Church ceased with the death of Charles II. His Church principles were very high, and therefore he was obnoxious to James II; for, being a high churchman, he was, of course, distinguished by a zeal against Popery. And this circumstance renders his adherence to James II., on the occurrence of the revolution, in 1688, the more honourable. After that event he became involved in trouble.

The crown having been settled on William and Mary, it became necessary to adopt measures to secure the stability of the government: and the most important question related to the Oath of Allegiance. In its original state it presented very serious difficulties, inasmuch as it so strongly implied the doctrine of hereditary right. It was therefore altered into the following simple form:—"I, A B, do sincerely promise and swear to bear true allegiance to their majesties King William and Queen Mary." The oath of supremacy consisted of two parts: the one an oath of abhorrence of the Pope's excommunicating power: the other a declaration, that no foreign prince or power had, or ought to have, any jurisdiction in this kingdom.

We need not dwell upon the various particulars connected with the conversion of the convention into a

parliament. It is sufficient for our purpose to state, that the new oath was taken by the two houses in March, 1688-9, with the exception of some, who entertained scruples on the subject. The oath was taken by the Archbishop of York, and by the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Bristol, Winchester, Rochester, Llandaff, and St. Asaph's: and subsequently, by the Bishops of Carlisle and St. David's: it was refused by Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Turner, Bishop of Ely, Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester, Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, White, Bishop of Peterborough, Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, Lake, Bishop of Chichester, and Cartwright, Bishop of Chester. Thomas, Lake, and Cartwright, died during the year, and thus six prelates were left, who refused to swear allegiance to the new sovereigns. The act of parliament required all ecclesiastical persons to take the oath before the *first* of August, 1689, under pain of suspension from the performance of their duties; but six months were allowed, after suspension, before deprivation: so that those who did not comply before the *first* day of February, 1689-90, would be deprived of their ecclesiastical preferments.

That the approach of the day was contemplated with much anxiety, by all parties, is evident. Some of those, who had hitherto scrupled to take the oath, complied at the last moment, and thus avoided deprivation: but the majority had counted the cost, and remained firm in their adherence to the principle, on which they had acted ever since the new oath had been proposed. On the *first* day of February, therefore, Sancroft, Turner, Frampton, White, and Ken, were deprived by act of parliament of their sees. They were restrained from the exercise of their office in their dioceses, as well as deprived of the incomes of their respective bishoprics; but their spiritual character could not be touched by an act of parliament. After the *first* of February, 1690-91, they were bishops of



the Catholic Church, though they were precluded from the public exercise of their sacred functions, by authority of the civil power. The example of the bishops was followed by about *four hundred* of the clergy, most, if not all of whom, would have lived quietly and peaceably, discharging the duties of their office with diligence, if the government would have dispensed with the oath of allegiance. This was a considerable number; and when we consider, that all of them were so conscientious, as to prefer principle to expediency or interest, we cannot but regret, that some means were not adopted to prevent such a sad separation. The names of many of these peaceable sufferers are preserved in the Life of Kettlewell. Some, however, were omitted, and it is not now possible to recover them. In this list are the names of some of the chief men in the kingdom, both with respect to learning and influence. Not unfrequently the nonjurors are spoken of contemptuously, as men of narrow minds and perverted principles: but no one, who fully examines the subject, will indulge in such a tone of remark respecting men, who suffered so much from adherence to their principles.

Most of the clergy quietly quitted their livings on the *first* of February: but some of the bishops and dignitaries felt themselves bound to offer such resistance as they were able. Such was the case with Dr. Hickes. He retained his deanery in fact till the following May, no one appearing to molest him, though he refused to take the oaths.

When reading in the gazette that the deanery of Worcester was granted to Talbot, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, Salisbury, and Durham, successively, he immediately drew up a claim of right to it, directed to all the members of that church, and in 1691 affixed it over the great entrance into the choir. The Earl of Nottingham, then secretary of state, called it Dr. Hickes's Manifesto against Government; and it was afterwards published by Dr. Francis Lee, in the appendix to his Life of Mr

Kettlewell, with this title, The Protestation of Dr. George Hickes, and claim of right, fixed up in the cathedral church of Worcester. Expecting on this account the resentment of the government, he privately withdrew to London, where he concealed himself for many years, till May 1699, when Lord Somers, then chancellor, procured an act of council, by which the attorney-general was ordered to cause a *noli prosequi* to be entered to all proceedings against him. During a portion of this period he resided with White Kennet, wearing a lay-habit, and affecting to be unknown. Disagreeing as they did, they could not converse on ecclesiastical matters : consequently they met on the common ground of literature. At Kennet's suggestion he undertook his most laborious work, the "Thesaurus." At last, a fellow of a college in Oxford, coming to Kennet's house, knew him, and called him by his name. This alarmed him : so that he immediately repaired to London, where he remained until the lord chancellor interposed. It is stated that he once contemplated taking the oaths : but the authority on which the report rests appears doubtful. The inscription on his tomb, written by his own direction in his will, is adduced as evidence, simply because it does not notice the fact of his appointment as a suffragan bishop. The inscription was as follows : "Depositum Georgii Hickes, S. T. P. non ita pridem Coll. Linc. Oxon. Socii, et Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Wigornensis Decani, qui Obiit 15 Die Decembris 1715." It is very properly remarked, that no mention of the title of the suffragan would at that time have been permitted : consequently nothing can be inferred in favour of the notion that he disclaimed the title.

Soon after their deprivation, Archbishop Sancroft and his colleagues began to consider about maintaining and continuing the episcopal succession among those who adhered to them ; and, having resolved upon it, they sent Dr. Hickes over to France, with a list of the deprived

clergy, to confer with James II. about that matter. The doctor set out in May, 1693, and had several audiences of the king, who complied with all he asked. Dr. Hickes returned to England in February, 1694, and on the eve of St. Matthias, the consecrations were performed by Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Turner, Bishop of Ely, and Dr. White, Bishop of Peterborough, at the Bishop of Peterborough's lodgings in the Rev. Mr. Giffard's house, at Southgate. Hickes was consecrated suffragan Bishop of Thetford, and Wagstaffe, suffragan of Ipswich; at which solemnity Henry, Earl of Clarendon, is said to have been present.

An account of this matter was drawn up and left in MS. by Hickes; and it is thus alluded to by Lindsay, a nonjuror of eminence in the last century. "I have seen an account of this affair in MS., drawn up (I suppose) by Dr. Hickes himself; out of which I shall oblige my reader with the following particulars: viz. that after the deprivation of the Archbishop and his brethren, they immediately began to think of continuing their succession by new consecrations, and often discoursed of it, without taking any particular resolutions, till after the consecration of the intruders (as they called them) into their sees; that then the deprived archbishop and bishops resolved to continue the same, and to write to the late King James about it: that in their discourses on this matter, the deprived Bishop of Ely acquainted the archbishop and his brethren with the letters in St. John's College Library in Cambridge, which had passed upon the like occasion between chancellor Hyde and Dr. Barwick; and thereupon they had recourse to those letters, and resolved to impart the secret to the then Earl of Clarendon, who had been his father's secretary in that correspondence; that from those letters, and the additional light which they received from that noble lord, it appeared that, in that case, in regard of the difficulties of making elections, it was resolved to consecrate the new bishops with suffra-



gan titles, according to the statute of King Henry VIII. That therefore the deprived archbishop and bishops resolved upon the same method in this case also, and to write to the late King James for his consent to it in the way directed by that statute; though (it seems) they judged it a matter of so great importance as to resolve to do it even without his consent rather than not at all: that upon their application, the late King James returned his answer, that he would readily concur with it, and required them to send some person over to him, with whom he might further confer about the matter, and along with him a list of the deprived clergy: that Dr. George Hickes being made choice of for that purpose, set forward from London May 19th, 1693, and, after many difficulties, arrived at St. Germain's in about six weeks time: that there the late King James acquainted him that, for the further satisfaction of his own conscience, he had consulted the Archbishop of Paris and the Bishop of Meaux, and the Pope himself, who severally determined that the Church of England being established by the laws of the kingdom, he (though a Papist) was under no obligation of conscience to act against it, but obliged to maintain and defend it, as long as those laws are in force: that the late King James put their said determinations into the doctor's hands: which he read and found to be to the effect aforesaid; that the said late King James also assured him, that he had on all occasions justified the Church of England since the revolution. That the doctor returned to London, 4th of February, 1693, and was consecrated on the 24th." Such is Lindsay's account of this remarkable circumstance.

Hickes was from this time the chief man among the nonjurors. When the last of the deprived bishops was no more, Dodwell, Nelson, and other celebrated nonjurors conformed once more to the Church, as established. They adhered to the deprived bishops, and regarding those who had succeeded them in their sees as intruders

and usurpers, refused allegiance to them. But when there were no longer any bishops living who had been deprived, they did not perceive that any principle was concerned, and they were unwilling to prolong a schism. Hickes thought differently. He and his followers took steps to perpetuate the schism. But here a difficulty occurred. Bishop Wagstaffe died in 1712, and as the deprived bishops had not consecrated any others, Hickes was left alone. He, therefore, could not continue the succession himself, because three bishops are required by the canons at consecrations. Under these circumstances, he had recourse to Scotland, and Campbell and Gadderar assisted in 1713, in consecrating Jeremiah Collier, Samuel Hawes, and Nathaniel Spinckes. Hickes must have known, that the Bishops of Scotland could not lawfully interfere in another province. Rather, however, than lose the opportunity of continuing the schism, he adopted this irregular proceeding, fearing probably, that some of the nonjurors would have returned to the national communion, unless a provision were made for the succession of bishops.

Hickes did not long survive the consecration of Collier, Spinckes, and Hawes. He died of the stone, December 15, 1715. He was a man of universal learning; and in his controversies with the Romanists he proved himself a sound and acute reasoner, and confirmed his arguments with exact and elaborate proofs. He was well versed in the old Northern languages, and in antiquities, and has given us some works on these subjects, which will be valued when all his other productions are forgotten. He was deeply read in the writings of the fathers, whom he considered as the best expositors of Scripture; and as no one better understood the doctrine, worship, constitution, and discipline of the Church universal in the first ages of Christianity, it was his utmost endeavour to prove the Church of England perfectly conformable to them.

His principal works are: 1. *Institutiones Grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonicæ and Mæso-Gothicæ*. *Grammatica Islan-*

dica Runolphi Jonæ. Catalogus librorum Septentrionalium. Accedit Edwardi Bernardi Etymologicum Britannicum,—Oxon. 1689, 4to. inscribed to Archbishop Sancroft. While the dean was writing the preface to this book, there were great disputes in the house of commons, and throughout the kingdom, about the original contract; which occasioned him to insert the ancient coronation oath of our Saxon kings, to shew, which was not very necessary, that there is not the least footstep of any such contract. 2. *Antiquæ literaturæ Septentrionalis libri duo: quorum primus G. Hiccesii S. T. P. Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium thesaurum grammatico-criticum et Archæologicum, ejusdem de antiquæ literaturæ Septentrionalis utilitate dissertationem epistolarum, et Andreæ Fountaine equitis aurati numismata Saxonica et Dano-Saxonica, complectitur: alter continet Humfredi Wanleii librorum Veterum Septentrionalium, qui in Angliæ Bibliis extant, catalogum historico-criticum, necnon multorum veterum codicum Septentrionalium alibi extantium notitiam, cum totius operis sex indicibus*,—Oxon. 1705, 2 or sometimes 3 vols. folio. Foreigners as well as Englishmen, who had any relish for antiquities, have justly admired this splendid and laborious work, which is now scarce and dear. It was originally published at £3 3s. the small, and £5. 5s. the large paper copy. The latter now rarely appears, and the former is worth £15. The grand duke of Tuscany's envoy sent a copy of it to his master, which his highness, looking into, and finding full of strange characters, called a council of the Dotti, and commanded them to peruse and give him an account of. They did so, and reported it to be an excellent work, and that they believed the author to be a man of a particular head; for this was the envoy's compliment to Hickes, when he went to him with a present from his master. 3. Two volumes of Sermons, most of which were never before printed, with a preface by Mr. Spinckes, 1713, 8vo. After his death was pub-



lished another volume of his Sermons, with some pieces relating to schism, separation, &c. 4. A Letter sent from beyond the seas to one of the chief ministers of the nonconforming party, &c. 1674; which was afterwards reprinted in 1684, under the title of "The judgment of an anonymous writer concerning these following particulars: first, a law for disabling a papist to inherit the crown; secondly, the execution of penal laws against protestant dissenters; thirdly, a bill of comprehension: all briefly discussed in a letter sent from beyond the seas to a dissenter ten years ago." This letter was in reality an answer to his elder brother, Mr. John Hickes, a dissenting minister, bred up in Cromwell's time at the college of Dublin; whom the doctor always endeavoured to convince of his errors, but without success. John persisted in them to his death, and at last suffered for his adherence to the Duke of Monmouth; though, upon the doctor's unwearied application, the king would have granted him his life, but that he had been falsely informed that this Mr. Hickes was the person who advised the Duke of Monmouth to take upon him the title of king. 5. Ravillac Redivivus, being a narrative of the late trial of Mr. James Mitchell, a conventicle preacher, who was executed Jan. 18, 1677, for an attempt on the person of the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, &c. 6. The Spirit of Popery speaking out of the mouths of fanatical protestants; or, the last speeches of Mr. John Kid and Mr. John King, two presbyterian ministers, who were executed for high treason at Edinburgh, on Aug. 14, 1679. These pieces were published in 1680, and they were occasioned by his attendance on the Duke of Lauderdale in quality of chaplain. The spirit of faction made them much read, and did the author considerable service with several great personages, and even with the king. 7. Jovian; or, an answer to Julian the apostate: printed twice in 1683, 8vo. This is an ingenious and learned tract in defence of passive obedience and non-resistance, against the cele-

brated Samuel Johnson, the author of "Julian." 8. The case of Infant Baptism, 1683; printed in the second volume of the "London Cases, 1585," 4to. 9. Speculum beatæ Virginis, a discourse on Luke i. 28, of the due praise and honour of the Virgin Mary, by a true catholic of the Church of England, 1686. 10. An apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, in answer to her adversaries, who reproach her with the English heresies and schisms, 1686, 4to; reprinted, with many additions, a large preface, and an appendix of "Papers relating to the Schisms of the Church of Rome;" 1706, 8vo. 11. The celebrated story of the Theban Legion no fable: in answer to the objections of Dr. Gilbert Burnet's Preface to his translation of Lactantius de mortibus persecutorum, with some remarks on his Discourse of Persecution; written in 1687, but not published till 1714, for reasons given in the preface. 12. Reflections upon a Letter out of the country to a member of this present parliament, occasioned by a Letter to a member of the house of commons, concerning the bishops lately in the Tower, and now under suspension, 1689. The author of the letter to which these reflections are an answer, was generally presumed to be Dr. Burnet, though that notion was afterwards contradicted. 13. A Letter to the author of a late paper entitled A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, &c. in defence of the history of passive obedience, 1689. The author of the "Vindication," was Dr. Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, though his name was not to it. 14. A Word to the Wavering, in answer to Dr. Gilbert Burnet's Inquiry into the present state of affairs, 1689. 15. An Apology for the new Separation, in a letter to Dr. Sharp, Archbishop of York, &c. 1691. 16. A Vindication of some among ourselves against the false principles of Dr. Sherlock, &c. 1692. 17. Some Discourses on Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson, occasioned by the late funeral sermon of the former upon the latter, 1695. It is remarkable, that in this piece

Hickes has not scrupled to call Tillotson an atheist. 18. The Pretences of the Prince of Wales examined and rejected, &c. 1701. 19. A letter in the "Philosophical Transactions," entitled, "Epistola viri Rev. D. G. Hickesii S. T. P. ad D. Hans Sloane, M. D. and S. R. Secr. de vari lectione inscriptionis, quæ in statua Tagis exaratur per quatuor alphabeta Hetrusca. 20. Several Letters which passed between Dr. G. Hickes and a Popish priest, &c. 1705. The person on whose account this book was published, was the lady Theophila Nelson, wife of Robert Nelson, Esq. 21. A second collection of controversial Letters relating to the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as they passed between Dr. G. Hickes and an honourable lady, 1710. This lady was the lady Gratiana Carew, of Hadcomb in Devonshire. 22. Two Treatises; one of the Christian Priesthood, the other of the dignity of the episcopal order, against a book entitled, The Rights of the Christian Church. The third edition in 1711, enlarged into two volumes, 8vo. 23. A seasonable and modest apology in behalf of the Rev. Dr. Hickes and other nonjurors, in a letter to Thomas Wise, D.D., 1710. 24. A Vindication of Dr. Hickes, and the author of the seasonable and modest apology, from the reflections of Dr. Wise, &c. 1712. 25. Two Letters to Robert Nelson, Esq., relating to Bishop Bull; published in Bull's life. 26. Some Queries proposed to civil, canon, and common lawyers, 1712; printed, after several editions, in 1714, with another title. Seasonable Queries relating to the birth and birthright of a certain person. Besides the works enumerated here, there are many prefaces and recommendations written by him, at the earnest request of others, either authors or editors.—*Kettlewell's Life. Lathbury's Nonjurors. Kennet's Life. Doyly's Sancroft.*

## HILARION.

HILARION was born about the year 291, and died in



371. The following account of him is given by the ancient historian Sozomen :—

“ Hilarion, the divine, acquired great celebrity. He was a native of Tanata, a village situated near the town of Gaza, towards the south, and near a torrent which falls into the sea, and is known by the same name as the village. When he was studying grammar at Alexandria, he went out into the desert to see Anthony, the divine and celebrated monk, and discoursed with him concerning his mode of life and philosophy. A very short time afterwards, he fixed his residence with him, but did not enjoy the quietude he anticipated, on account of the multitudes who flocked around Anthony. He, therefore, soon returned to his own country, and finding his parents dead, he distributed his patrimony among his brethren and the poor, without reserving any thing for himself. He then went to dwell in a desert situated near the sea, and about twenty stadia from his native village. His cell was constructed of planks, broken tiles and straw, and was of such a height and length that no one could stand in it without bending the head, or lie down in it without drawing back the leg ; for in every thing he strove to accustom himself to hardship and to the subjugation of sensuality. The practice of temperance was never carried to a greater height than by him ; he endured cold and heat, hunger and thirst, and other sufferings, and resisted the desires of the mind and of the body. He was irreproachable in conduct, grave in discourse, and diligent in the study of sacred writ. He was so beloved by God that even now many diseases are healed and demons expelled at his tomb. It is remarkable that he was first interred in the island of Cyprus, but that his remains are now deposited in Palestine ; for it so happened that he died during his residence in Cyprus, and was buried by the inhabitants with great honour and respect. But Hesychius, one of the most renowned of his disciples, stole the

body, conveyed it to Palestine, and interred it in his own monastery. From that period an annual festival was celebrated in honour of his memory, for it is the custom in Palestine to bestow this honour on those who have attained renown by their sanctity, such as Aurelius, Antedon, Alexion, a native of Bethagatonia, and Alaphion, a native of Asalia, who, during the reign of Constantius, lived so religiously and so virtuously in the practice of philosophy, that many Pagans were led by their example to embrace Christianity."

#### HILARY, SAINT.

SAINT HILARY, a Father of the Church, was born at Poitiers in France, of Pagan parents. Of the manner of his conversion to Christianity we have the following account:—

"Having seriously considered the folly and vanity of Pagan idolatry, he began to think with himself, that the professors of this could never be competent tutors and guides to truth. Whereupon he set himself to contemplate the visible frame of things, and to conclude that the same Power that made, must preserve and steer all things, that in an almighty and incorruptible Being, there could be no sexes, no successive generations, that the Author of all could have nothing without Himself, and that omnipotency and eternity were necessary and incommunicable perfections of the Divine nature, incapable of agreeing to any more than one. While he was engaged in these and such like reflections, he met with the books of the Old Testament, wherein he was greatly surprised with that short, but comprehensive account of God, *I am that I am*. This put him upon further researches, and he was infinitely delighted with his speculations concerning the nature and perfections of God, to pursue the knowledge of Whom (so far as attain-

able) he reckoned to be one of the most kindly offices he could perform to his great Creator. In this pursuit he was mightily encouraged by the natural sense he had of future rewards, and that it was not enough only to have right notions of God, unless there was a lively hope that good men should be happy in another life, and that it was an unworthy apprehension of God, to conceive that so noble a being as the soul of man, made to understand, adore, and enjoy its Maker, should expire with the last breath. From hence he proceeded to survey the revelation of the gospel, and so arrived to the knowledge of God the Son, and the great end and advantages of His coming into the world, the divinity of His person, and the great mystery of His incarnation, that He was, *God of God, the Word that was God, and that in the beginning was with God*, of the same nature, glory, and eternity with his Father, *the Word that was made flesh*, being both God and Man in one person. Furnished with this accurate knowledge of the Christian doctrine, he was baptized, or to use his own phrase, he was called by faith into the new nativity, and to obtain the heavenly regeneration, which he knew to be the pledge and assurance of a future and better life. And now he resigned up his understanding to the authority of divine truth, avoiding all captious and sophistical questions, and resolving the more sublime and intricate articles into the veracity and power of God, not peremptorily concluding that to be false, which his shallow capacity could not presently comprehend.

“ We have little account how he bestowed the former part of his life, only that he was married, and by his wife he had one only daughter, called Abra, whom he took care to train up in all the principles of religion, and in the paths of piety and virtue. With his wife he cohabited even after his preferment to the episcopal function, as the more ingenuous of the Roman communion dare not deny, and that marriage was not then thought to be incon-



sistent with that office, nay that married men were oftener chosen to it, than single persons, who (as St. Jerome himself grants) were not so fit for the pastoral care, as the other; but withal they tell us, that in those days the Church had defined nothing in this matter. And surely had the Church of Rome never made any such constitution, nor pressed the observance of it with so much rigour and importunity, the Christian world might have been free from infinite scandals and inconveniences which this one constitution of ecclesiastical celibacy has brought upon it. St. Hilary while yet a layman, took not that liberty, in which men of secular employments usually indulge themselves, but so carefully kept himself in the rules of ecclesiastical discipline, that he seemed to be particularly designed by heaven for some eminent dignity and authority in the Church. He was admirably strict in the government of his life, and true to the interests of the Catholic faith; with the enemies whereof he would not eat, no nor so much as salute them when he met them. A good part of his time he spent in instructing others, explaining to them the nature and principles of religion, and informing them in the right belief of the Holy Trinity, other times persuading them to the virtues of a good life, by laying before them the infinite rewards of heaven and immortality. An employment that would be thought much below a gentleman in this loose and degenerate life.

In the year 355, according to Barmius, though Cave dates the appointment some years sooner, he was consecrated Bishop of Poitiers, and he immediately became a zealous champion of the orthodox faith in France, where the Arians were gaining ground. Against the Arian heresy, he wrote his twelve books of the Trinity. The first book is a preface to the whole work, and states the general principles which the author would enforce. In the second book, he explains the Catholic doctrine concerning the three Divine Persons in the Trinity, so as to

vindicate it from the heretics. He confesses the doctrine to be above reason, and asking the reader whether he can comprehend how he came into this world, how he received feeling, life, perception, taste, sight, understanding, and other senses, and how he can communicate them to others, he exclaims: "Te'l me, O man, if thou canst comprehend how all this is done; and if thou canst not comprehend it, with what face dost thou demand an explanation of the generation of the Son of God? Thou that art so ignorant of what passes in thyself, wilt thou be so insolent as to complain for not knowing what passes in God?"

In the 3rd Book he proves the divinity of the Son of God by the words in the Gospel of St. John: "I am in My Father, and My Father is in Me."

In the 4th Book he answers the objections of the heretics, and proves the divinity of the Word out of passages of the Old Testament.

In the 5th Book, continuing the same subject, he maintains that it was the Word Which appeared to Abraham, and Jacob, and Moses, and other patriarchs, Who is called an angel, because of His ministry, and not because of His nature.

In the 6th Book he proves our Lord's divinity by the testimony of the fathers, by our Lord's declarations, by the preaching of the apostles, by the confession of the faithful, and the acknowledgment even of devils.

In the 7th Book, he shews that the Son of God is truly God. There he observes, that the heretics use very great address and subtilty to maintain their corrupt opinions, which they falsely pretend to have from religion; that they deceive the simple by their expressions, which are Catholic in appearance; that they accommodate themselves to the wisdom of this world; that they corrupt the true sense of Scripture expressions, by the explications which they add, as it were to give an account of what they say. He adds, that it is this which renders

the matter of the Trinity a difficult subject to treat on. "For if on the one side," says he, "I declare that there is but one God, Sabellius will think that I espouse his opinion; if I say, that the Son is God, the modern heretics will accuse me of admitting two Gods; if I affirm, that the Son is born of the Virgin, Ebion and Photinus will make use of this truth, to establish their impiety. But," says he, "the doctrine of the Church confounds all these errors. The power of truth is so great, that even its enemies explain it; that the more it is opposed, the more force it gains; and certainly, the Church was never more triumphant, than when it was most vigorously attacked: it was never more famous, than when it was reproached: it was never more powerful, than when it seemed to be abandoned. She wishes, that all men would continue in her bosom, and she is never more troubled, than when she is obliged to throw any one out, and deliver him up to the devil. But when the heretics go out from her, or when she casts them out, as she loses on one side the occasion of giving them salvation, so she gains this advantage on the other, of discovering the happiness of those who continue inviolably fixed in her communion." And a few lines after, he adds, "All heretics attack the Church, and while they attack the Church, they overcome one another. But the victory is gained to the Church and not to them; for they all quarrel about those errors, which are equally rejected by the Church. Sabellius, for instance, does unanswerably confute the error of Arius; Arius confounds the error of Photinus, and so of the rest: but in vain do they mutually conquer one another, for they are always overcome in some article or other, and the Church alone remains victorious over all errors, by professing that Jesus Christ is the true God, Son of the true God, begotten before all ages, and afterwards born of Mary." Lastly, he proves that He is God, because the name of God is given Him in the New Testament, and from what is there said of His birth, His nature, His power, and His actions.



The rest of the work is occupied in refuting the objections of the heretics drawn from particular texts.

According to Dupin, he finished this book about the time he was threatened with banishment, though Cave and Butler make it the employment of his time when in exile. In the year 356 he was banished to Phrygia, by order of the Emperor Constantius, at the instigation of Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, an Arian heretic, for having defended St. Athanasius at a synod held at Beterra or Berziers. He remained an exile upwards of three years. During this time he wrote a Treatise concerning Synods, which he addressed to the Bishops of France ; wherein he explains to them the sense of the Eastern Churches upon the doctrine of the Trinity, and also their manner of holding councils. This treatise was drawn up by Hilary, after the council of Ancyra in 358, whose canons he sets forth in it ; and before the councils of Rimini and Seleucia, which were called in the beginning of the year 359. Some time after he was sent to the council of Seleucia, where he defended the Gallican bishops from the imputation of Sabellianism, which the Arians had fixed upon them ; and boldly asserted the sound and orthodox faith of the Western bishops. He was so favourably received, and so much respected by this council, that they admitted him as one, who should give in his opinion, and assist in a determination among their bishops ; but finding the greater part of them to be Arian, he would not act. Nevertheless he continued at Seleucia, till the council was over ; when seeing the orthodox faith in the utmost peril, he followed the deputies of the council to Constantinople, and petitioned the emperor to dispute publicly with the Arians. The Arians perceiving what a powerful adversary they were likely to find in Hilary, contrived to have him sent to France, whither, passing through Italy, he arrived in the year 360, without being absolved in the mean time from the sentence of banishment. However, after the Catholic bishops had

recovered their usual liberty and authority under Julian the apostate, Hilary assembled several councils in France, to re-establish the ancient orthodox faith, and to condemn the determinations of the synods of Rimini and Seleucia. He condemned Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, but pardoned those who acknowledged their error; and, in short, he bestirred himself so heartily in this great affair, that, as Sulpicius Severus says, it was agreed on all hands, that France was in great measure freed from Arianism by the single influence and endeavours of Hilary. He extended his care likewise on this account to Italy and foreign Churches, and was particularly qualified, as Ruffinus observes, to recover men from the error of their ways, because he was "*vir natura lenis, placidus, simulque eruditus, et ad persuadendum commodissimus*:"—"an excellent observation," says the candid Dupin, "and very proper lesson of instruction to all who are employed in the conversion of heretics."

About the year 367, Hilary had another opportunity of distinguishing his zeal against Arianism. The emperor Valentinian, coming to Milan, issued forth an edict, by which he obliged all to acknowledge Auxentius for their bishop. Hilary, persuaded that Auxentius was in his heart an Arian, presented a petition to the emperor, in which he declared Auxentius to be a blasphemer, whose opinions were opposite to those of the Church. Upon this the emperor ordered Hilary and Auxentius to dispute it publicly; where Auxentius, after many subtleties and evasive shifts to prevent being deposed from his bishopric, was forced to own, that Jesus Christ "was indeed God; of the same substance and divinity with the Father." The emperor believed this profession sincere, and embraced his communion; but Hilary continued still to call him a heretic, and most wicked prevaricator with God and man: on which account he was ordered to depart from Milan, as one who disturbed the peace of the Church. Hilary died the latter end of this year,

after many struggles and endeavours to support the Catholic faith.

His Commentary on the Psalms is entirely taken from the commentaries of Origen and St. Augustine.

This father maintained some erroneous tenets; among others, that Christ experienced no pain at His crucifixion, and that the souls of men are material.

His works have been published by Miræus, Paris, 1544; Erasmus, Basle, 1523, reprinted 1526, 1535, 1550, 1570; Gillot, Paris, 1572, 1605, 1631, 1652; by the Benedictines, Paris, 1693; the Marquis de Maffei, Verona, 1730; and Oberthür, 4 vols, 8vo, 1781-88.—*Works. Cave. Dupin.*

## HILARY, OF ARLES.

HILARY, OF ARLES, was born in France, of noble and opulent parents, about 401. Having been persuaded by his relation Honoratus, abbot of Lerins, to devote himself to the religious life, he sold his patrimonial estate, distributed the money arising from it among the poor, and entered into the monastery of Lerins, where he applied with diligence to theological studies. When, in 426, Honoratus was promoted to the see of Arles, Hilary accompanied him to that city; but his love of retirement soon recalled him to Lerins. In 429 he returned to Arles, to close the eyes of his kinsman; and after his death, he was unanimously elected his successor. He maintained himself by the labour of his own hands, and applied the profits of his see, and the offerings of the people, to works of benevolence and charity. He was an eloquent and impressive preacher, and boldly rebuked the vices of the great. He was also a strict promoter of ecclesiastical discipline among the clergy, and opposed the interference of the papal power. By the exercise of this spirit he brought upon himself the resentment of



pope Leo, who had reinstated Celidonius, Bishop of Vesontio (Besancon) who had been deposed from his office by a council, at which Hilary presided. Hilary spent the remainder of his days in the laborious discharge of his pastoral duties, and in the exercise of religious austerities, which wore out his constitution, and hastened his death in 449, when he was about forty-eight years of age. In 439 he presided at the council of Reiz; and in 441 at that of Orleans.

His name is chiefly celebrated by the fact, that to him is attributed, by some writers, the compilation of the Athanasian Creed. The chief supporter of this opinion is our learned Dr. Waterland, who concludes his chapter on the subject in his Treatise on the Athanasian Creed thus: "The sum then of what I have presumed to advance upon probable conjecture, in a case which will not admit of full and perfect evidence, is this: that Hilary, once Abbot of Lerins, and next Bishop of Arles, about the year 430 composed the Exposition of Faith which now bears the name of the Athanasian Creed. It was drawn up for the use of the Gallican clergy, and especially for the diocese or province of Arles. It was esteemed by as many as were acquainted with it, as a valuable summary of the Christian faith. It seems to have been in the hands of Vincentius, monk of Lerins, before 434, by what he has borrowed from it; and to have been cited in part by Avitus of Vienne, about the year 500, and by Cæsarius of Arles before the year 543. About the year 570, it became famous enough to be commented upon like the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed, and together with them. All this while, and perhaps for several years lower, it had not yet acquired the name of the *Athanasian* faith, but was simply styled the *Catholic faith*. But before 670, Athanasius's admired name came in to recommend and adorn it; being in itself also an excellent system of the Athanasian principles of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, in opposition chiefly to Arians-

Macedonians, and Apollinarians. The name of the faith of Athanasius, in a while, occasioned the mistake of ascribing it to him, as his composition. This gave it authority enough to be cited and appealed to as standard, in the disputes of the middle ages, between Greeks and Latins about the *Procession*; and the same admired name, together with the intrinsic worth and value of the form itself, gave it credit enough to be received into the *public* service in the Western Churches; first in France, next in Spain, soon after in Germany, England, Italy, and at length in Rome itself; while many other excellent creeds drawn up in councils, or recommended by emperors, yet never arrived to any such honour and esteem as this hath done. The truly good and great author, (as I now suppose him,) though ill used by the then Pope of Rome, and not kindly treated, with respect to his memory, in after ages, has nevertheless been the mouth of all the Western Churches, and some Eastern too, for a long tract of centuries, in celebrating the glories of the coeternal Trinity. And so may he ever continue, till the Christian Churches can find out (which they will not easily do) a juster, or sounder, or more accurate form of faith than this is."

His other works are, the Life of St. Honoratus, his predecessor; An Heroical Poem on the Beginning of the Book of Genesis; and a short Letter to Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons; which are inserted in the seventh volume of the *Biblioth. Patr.*—*Cave. Dupin. Waterland.*

## HILDEBRAND.

HILDEBRAND, afterwards known as Gregory VII., was born between the years 1010 and 1020 of lowly parentage. He was most probably educated at the monastery of St. Mary, on Aventine Hill, at Rome, under the auspices of his uncle the abbot. Disgusted with the immorality of

Rome, he fixed his residence, when he arrived at man's estate, at Cluni in Burgundy. In this place he soon attracted the notice of his superiors, by the powers of his mind and his application to study. Either at Cluni, or before he left Italy, he had assumed the monastic habit. After a time he determined to return to Rome, but on his way to Italy appeared at the court of Henry III., where he became a popular preacher; the monarch, with, we presume, evangelical discernment, declaring that he had never heard any one preach with such boldness the pure and unadulterated word. But when he was at Rome, his strictness so offended the self-indulgent churchmen of that city, that he was only prevented, as he said, by a dream from quitting it for ever. He remained at Rome, and became the supporter and friend of Gregory VI., and accompanied that pontiff, when deposed, into Germany. On the death of Gregory VI. he retired again to Cluni, and was appointed the prior of that monastery, enjoying another short interval of retirement and uninterrupted devotion.

Here he remained until summoned to attend upon Leo IX., a summons to which he refused to give heed, unless the pontiff rendered the imperial appointment of himself canonical by the election of the clergy and people of Rome.

Nothing could have been worse than the state of the Church at this period: as a contemporary remarks, "Holiness had disappeared, justice had perished, truth had been buried, Simon Magus lording it over the Church, whose bishops and priests were given to luxury and fornication."

Under Leo, acting with the advice of Hildebrand, a reformation was commenced; a reformation rendered necessary by circumstances, conducted by those who had authority to reform, and only failing in its ultimate success by the enforcement of the celibacy of the clergy. The constrained celibacy of the clergy led to further evils,



which demanded another reformation. Still it is to be borne in mind that when Hildebrand first became a public character, the infamies prevalent among the clergy were such as to have endangered the very existence of society. This he determined to correct, and he succeeded.

Hildebrand commenced as a reformer on a small scale ; having purified the monastery of St. Paul, over which he was placed by the pope. To this monastery he was devoted through life, and felt himself to be benefited by the prayers of its reverend and pious monks.

On the death of Leo, the eyes of men were turned to his friend and counsellor, Hildebrand, as his successor ; but he resisted the proposal, and persuaded his supporters to send him as their envoy to the imperial court, with power to select whom he might deem fittest for the exigences of the time, and to demand of the emperor that person, in their name, as the future pontiff.

In this he acted as a truly great man ; and his wisdom was displayed, to the surprise of all, in his selecting Gebherd, Bishop of Eichstadt, the emperor's personal friend, who had been opposed to the papal reforms conducted under Hildebrand's counsels. The new Pope assumed the name of Victor II.

Victor had been averse to the honour thrust upon him, and was never quite reconciled to Hildebrand, for whose sake he disliked monks in general. But Hildebrand was not to be despised, and was sent by Victor as his legate to France, there to complete the reformation Leo had begun ; an office which he executed with his usual decision and judgment.

At the death of Victor, Hildebrand was again thought of by a large party as the fittest person to be made the pope, and was recommended to the notice of the electors by the very person who became Stephen IX. By Stephen IX., Hildebrand was honoured with every mark of confidence and esteem, and the independence of the Roman see was resolutely maintained. And when Stephen was

on the point of death, he conjured the most influential of the clergy and people to elect no pontiff without the concurrence of Hildebrand, who was then absent on a legation in Germany.

On Stephen's death, while the better part of the Roman clergy and laity were waiting for Hildebrand, John, Bishop of Veletri, was by the violence of faction nominated as pope, under the name of Benedict X. But by the decision of Hildebrand, he was put to flight, and Gerard, Bishop of Florence, was installed in the chair of St. Peter, by the name of Nicholas II. To this pontiff, as to his predecessors, Hildebrand acted as chief minister and adviser; and in this pontificate, by a decree of the council of Lateran, the election of future popes was virtually placed in the hands of the cardinals, though the rights of the emperor were to appearance maintained.

Nicholas was succeeded by Alexander II., and one of his first acts was the nomination of Hildebrand to be chancellor of the apostolical see. By the imperial party, an anti-pope was elected, in the person of Cadalons, Bishop of Parma, who seemed at one time almost triumphant; but the cause of Alexander, under the guidance of Hildebrand, at length prevailed; and the cause of Alexander was in fact the cause of the Church's independence asserted against the imperial court. It was said of Alexander, that he found the Church a handmaid, and left her free. This amiable and excellent pope died in 1073, and Hildebrand was his successor, elected by the acclamations of the people, and the unanimous vote of the cardinals. A more unanimous and joyous election never took place than that which called Gregory VII. to the papal throne. The mind of Gregory was too deeply impressed with the difficult nature of the duties which would devolve upon him, if he carried out his intentions of reforming the Church, to enable him to contemplate his elevation with any feelings but those of anxiety; though in the counsels of the papacy it was not probable

that any great change would take place by the elevation of one who had virtually guided them for so long a time. Hildebrand was only in deacon's orders at the time of his election, he was ordained priest the following week, and was afterwards consecrated to the episcopate.

He waged unceasing war against simony and clerical marriage, regarding these as the causes of the low standard of divinity and tone of morals among the clergy. In advocating the celibacy of the clergy he certainly committed a lamentable error, but it must be remembered that public opinion had so long condemned the marriage of the clergy, that the clergy could seldom obtain wives, except among persons in stations inferior to their own, so that instead of elevating their wives, their wives lowered their husbands in public estimation. As to simony, Gregory perceived that it could not be prevented, unless the independence of the Church was clearly asserted. And hence originated the controversy about investiture.

The investiture of bishops and abbots commenced undoubtedly when, lands and territories having been granted to the hierarchy, the prelates of the Church became identified with the dignitaries of the empire. By the laws of the times none were considered as lawful possessors of lands until, having repaired to their respective sovereigns, as the supreme proprietors, they had received at their hands a solemn mark by which their respective grants were assigned to them. Such was the practice with respect to the nobility, and those who had distinguished themselves in military exploits. Nor would the bishops and clergy have refused, by doing homage, or by receiving the emblems of their appointment from the sovereign, to have acknowledged that for their temporalities they were indebted to the state. The offence was taken at the *particular* form which prevailed: the symbols adopted were the sacerdotal ring and pastoral staff. And we can easily understand why the use of such symbols



gave offence to the pious among the clergy: they were not of a baronial or civil, not of an episcopal or sacred character; the ring typifying the espousals which the bishop in Christ's stead contracted with his Church; the staff, the pastoral superintendence which, as representing the great Shepherd, he was authorized to exercise over his flock. But if it had been only a question of pious sentiment, we cannot suppose that the emperors would have refused so obstinately, as they did, to change the form of investiture. We must therefore look further, and then we find that this particular form was selected because it seemed to be the only one by which the emperor could carry out his determination of appointing to the vacant sees. The emperors and princes had assumed the power of conferring on whom they pleased the bishoprics and abbeys as they became vacant in their dominions. To meet this evil, on the vacancy of a diocese, the clergy elected, according to ecclesiastical laws, the person they thought fit, and they had him consecrated without delay. The question with the emperor was, how to prevent the consecration, as the bishop would probably side with the clerical electors. And it was for this purpose the civil magistrates were ordered, when a bishop died, to take possession of his ring and crosier, and transmit them to the prince. For it was by the solemn delivery of the ring and crosier of the deceased to the new bishop that his election was confirmed, and this ceremony was an essential part of his consecration; so that when these two badges of the episcopal dignity were in the hands of the sovereign, the clergy were unable to procure the consecration of the person they elected. The emperor or prince having possession of these, conferred the vacant see upon his nominee, by delivering to him these two badges of the episcopal office, after which the bishop elect repaired to the metropolitan for consecration, delivering to him the ring and crosier, that he might receive it again at his hands.

The rights of the Church in the election of her bishops were thus superseded, the emperor or prince obtained the power of nomination, and the chief offices in the Church were offered to the highest bidder.

Well would it have been for the fame of Hildebrand, if he had confined his energies to a vindication of the liberties of the Church; but if the emperor was an aggressor upon the Church, the popes as ambitiously endeavoured to exercise dominion over the civil authority, which was quite preposterous. They sought as the pretended representatives of the Most High, Who "ruleth over all the kingdoms of the earth," to exercise a paramount lordship or suzerainty over the thrones of Christendom. As the emperor ruled supreme over the principalities where princes and dukes reigned, so over all kingdoms and empires the pope desired to exercise his authority. When the principle was admitted, Hildebrand was not the man to hesitate about acting upon it, and there is extant a most extraordinary letter from him, addressed to the grandees of Spain, in 1073, in which the suzerainty then was assumed. Perhaps the idea was that of restoring peace to divided Europe, by re-establishing the Roman empire under a spiritual head. It was this feature in the policy of Hildebrand that has rendered him an object of hatred to all secular historians, and those Erastian churchmen of our age, who have gone to the other extreme, and consider the Church to be merely a creature of the state.

Hildebrand, now Gregory VII., at first remained in peace, preparing for future exertions, and receiving an affectionate letter from Henry, professing filial duty and obedience.

Among the various subjects which occupied his mind in the early part of his reign, the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches was one. This would indeed form part of the mighty scheme which employed all his thoughts, the establishment of one vast spiritual empire.

He interchanged civilities with Michael Parapinaces, the Grecian emperor, but nothing further was accomplished.

The ambition of Hildebrand was not selfish. It was a devotion to the popedom, and to the extension of the papal authority. He was quite as ambitious for the papal authority before he was pope, as when he was himself on the papal throne. Such a one having devoted himself to such an object, and supposing it to be a godly one, would rather have laboured for it in a subordinate than in the supreme situation. But his advancement to the tiara was not likely to cool his ambitious desires, and to the support and extension of the papal power his care was immediately directed after his consecration. We find him writing to our own Archbishop Lanfranc, to assert the papal right, (which was in fact a usurpation) over monasteries and abbeys. We may, however, mention his advice to Renegius, Bishop of Lincoln, as indicating the merciful as well as the just notions of his mind. A priest having been guilty of homicide, he directed that he should be prohibited from officiating at the altar, but he advised the bishop to support him from the funds of the Church, lest by poverty and despair he should be led to further crime. While thus attending to the minute details of an English diocese, he was sending embassies to Greece, contending with ambitious nobles at home, and tendering his advice to the Carthaginians. We ought not to omit that while he thus zealously defended and extended the papal power, he was as zealously engaged in purifying the Church.

In these days when people are so eager to refer to the virtues of the middle ages, the following letter from Gregory to Sicard, Archbishop of Aquileia, will be read with profit.

“It cannot have escaped your observation, that the Church is tossed upon the waves of many commotions, and well-nigh shipwrecked and lost amid the miseries of her desolation. The rulers and princes of this world,



seeking their own, and not the things of Jesus Christ, and, having lost all reverence, oppress her as a vile bondmaid, and fear not to bring her to confusion, provided, that in so doing, they may gratify their own sinful desires. The priests too, and visible rulers of the Church, making light, for the most part, of the law of God, and defrauding at once Him and the sheep committed to their charge of the debt of duty which they owe, seek the dignities of the Church, for the sake of worldly grandeur alone; while those goods which should, by a careful dispensation, minister to the advantage and welfare of many, they either neglect, or unhappily waste in pomp and unnecessary profusion. And the people, in the mean while, subject to no episcopal control, guided by no reins of discipline into the way of righteousness, but rather instructed, by the example of those who are set over them, in all that is hurtful and opposed to the religion of Christ, are given to every kind of wickedness, and, deliberately depraving themselves, bear the name of Christians, I will not say without fulfilling the works which the Christian religion prescribes, but without even entertaining the faith which it inculcates. Wherefore, trusting in the mercy of God, we have determined on assembling a council in the first week of Lent, with the view of seeing whether, with the aid of the divine clemency, we may not find some palliation of, or some remedy for these fearful evils; that so in our time we may not see the irreparable ruin and destruction of the Church."

As usual, at the council, Gregory's favourite method of purifying the Church, by enforcing the celibacy of the clergy was pursued,—a measure which, by separating the priesthood from the mass of society, has been most injurious.

The weak and profligate Henry at this time being reduced to great distress by the insurrection of the Saxons, was found anxious, from political motives, to win Gregory's

favour, and even to exalt the pontifical authority; and Gregory was not slow to avail himself of the advantages within his reach. He invaded the liberties of the German and the French Churches, which resisted the aggression, but rather from temper than from principle: it was a great step gained for the papal supremacy, when an assumption of power was rather regarded as inexpedient than as unjustifiable. He endeavoured to encroach upon the Church of England, and Lanfranc, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was not likely to oppose him; but William the Conqueror was almost the only man whom Gregory respected, and towards him he conducted himself with caution. But Gregory brought upon himself the just indignation of the whole Church by a tyrannical act, which has made his name odious. Not only did he insist upon the future celibacy of the clergy, itself an act of demoralization, but he forced the married clergy to separate from their wives. The German clergy proclaimed him to be a madman and a heretic: they defied him to proceed. And Gregory resorted to the most unjustifiable and low-church proceedings in order to carry his object; he appealed to the laity, enjoining them to prevent by force the ministration of priests who disobeyed certain canons relating to celibacy, which he had caused to be passed at a Roman council. The consequence was, the greatest confusion was caused, and every tyrannical noble made this injunction the excuse for proceeding to acts of violence against every obnoxious clergyman. At the same time the persecuted clergy resorted to acts of violence against the prelates who tried to enforce the iniquitous regulations of Gregory.

At the same time we must admit that there was some need of interference, since we find in Normandy, where clerical marriages were completely established, churches had become property heritable by the sons and daughters of clergy; so that there was danger of there being a clerical caste. But this was no justification of the fanatical conduct of Gregory.

Gregory's attention was also directed to the miseries of the Asiatic Christians, and he doubtless prepared the way for the Crusades; indeed he seems to have been inclined to head a crusade himself. The spirit of a worldly politician appears to have crept over his mind on his elevation to the papal throne.

In the meantime he took decisive measures in a council at Rome against lay investitures. But he was now to receive a check. The base and tyrannical Henry having retrieved his fortunes and triumphed over the Saxons, assumed an attitude of hostility to the pope, whom he had meanly courted before, and surrounded by enemies, even in Rome itself, Gregory must have felt his condition precarious. The most open simony on the part of Henry and the nobles again prevailed,—benefices being put up to auction, and Gregory's power defied. An atrocious attempt was also made upon his life, as is supposed, with the knowledge of Henry.—While on Christmas eve the aged pontiff was celebrating the holy eucharist in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, armed men rushed upon him, wounded him, dragged him amid insults and blows, from the sanctuary, and carried him to a Tower, from whence they intended to bear him beyond the walls of Rome. The whole populace of Rome, however, rose on the instant, attacked the conspirators, and rescued the aged and insulted pontiff, whose presence of mind and dignity of character never deserted him for a moment.

The vigour of the pontiff was unshaken, for we find him soon after citing Henry to appear before him at Rome, to answer for his unjust and tyrannical conduct with respect to the see of Cologne, then vacant. Henry had determined, contrary to the wishes of nobles, clergy, and people, to prefer a worthless man to the archbishopric, when the pope interfered. Henry insulted the legates, and at a council held at Worms, procured a sentence of deposition against the pope, in which the Lombard



bishops soon after assembled at Piacenza, joined. The decision was notified to Gregory by an insolent epistle from the profligate Henry, when the pope was holding a council in Rome, and nothing but his authority prevented the people from tearing the messenger to pieces. Supported by the assembled prelates, and by others who wrote to him, he suspended the bishops who had attended the councils summoned by the king, and excommunicated Henry, suspending him from the enjoyment of the throne. For this monstrous assumption of power, Gregory would perhaps have endured even more than he had done. But it was a calamity to the Western Church, which at this time regarded the pope as the head of Christendom, that circumstances favoured this assumption of power on the part of Gregory; for the tyrannical conduct and the folly of Henry induced the majority of the nobles under him to take part with the pontiff, and to avail themselves of the excommunication to refuse to him obedience any longer. In vain were the most malignant falsehoods circulated against the pope among the populace by Henry's partizans; the people sided with the princes, and Henry saw on all sides his power melting away. The insurgent nobles were encouraged by Gregory, though some of them were wise enough to see the danger of tolerating so extreme an assertion of authority on the part of the Bishop of Rome, as was the excommunication and deposition of their legitimate sovereign. Gregory supported his authority by reference to apocryphal documents, and the people were too ready to listen to him, and in the end almost all the persons of high station in the empire, separated from Henry. A unanimous feeling prevailed against the unhappy king, —the people, whose constitutional rights he had invaded, the Church, and all orders of men, were determined to carry out the papal sentence. At Tribur, where the princes and prelates met in council, October, 1076, it was at first proposed to name a successor to the throne,

but it was finally determined that it should be left to the sole decision of the pope, whether Henry, on his humiliation and repentance, should continue to be king or not.

Henry now determined to humble himself before the pope, being deserted by all and reduced to the very greatest distress. With great difficulty and amidst many dangers, he crossed the Alps and appeared a penitent, supplicating pardon before the pope, at Canossa. Gregory now saw the triumph of his principles,—he had asserted that kings were only subjects of the Church, and that of them the pope was the sovereign. Many popes before had assumed this, but none had asserted it so strongly as Gregory, whose harsh and repulsive conduct on this occasion has procured for him an ill name with posterity. He now determined to let the world see the humiliation of the secular power, that thus he might establish his favourite principle of the universal empire of the pope. He desired to see the pope rule over all, and kings and emperors to reign under him. The stern pontiff for three days kept the king standing amidst an intense frost and without shoes, in the outer court of the Castle of Canossa. The inmates of the castle were shocked, and ventured to accuse Gregory of wanton cruelty. But the austere pope was unmoved, until at length, the countless multitude interceded for the king, and Gregory then, on the fourth day, permitted him, barefooted, and in his linen garment, to be brought before him. He then exacted from him conditions, which were intended to exalt the papal authority, and finally absolved him. He administered to him the eucharist, Gregory very solemnly protesting that he was innocent of the charges brought against him by the imperialists, and praying God to smite him with a sudden death if he were guilty.

The absolution having been pronounced, Gregory entertained Henry at a banquet, and the two potentates conversed in a friendly tone. But Henry returned from

Canossa determined to revenge himself upon the pope. His anger was favoured by the Italian prelates, who were generally the enemies of Gregory.

But the proud and ambitious pontiff now obtained new honours, in receiving from the Countess Matilda, the reversion of her territories, which form at the present day the principal portion of "the patrimony of St. Peter."

In the meantime the German princes and nobles, feeling that they were exonerated by the Pope from their oaths of allegiance to Henry, elected Rudolf as their king, with the consent of the papal legates. Hence the feud between Henry and Gregory became a deadly one.

Things now having been pushed to an extreme, a strong reaction took place in favour of Henry, who found himself at the head of a large army in Germany. And now Gregory made another attempt to advance the papal power,—he demanded a safe conduct from both kings into Germany, that he might, as pope, act as unpledged mediator between the two rivals. Here Gregory's conduct was base in the extreme. However impolitic the election of Rudolph was, yet Gregory was pledged, if not by words, at least in honour, to his cause. But the truth is, that after the scene at Canossa, which disgusted the princes and prelates of Northern Italy, and astonished all Europe, Gregory seems to have lost some portion of his energy, and to have adopted towards the rival kings, a temporizing policy. Such too was the case when he demanded of our William the Conqueror, an oath of fealty. This King William bluntly and haughtily refused, and Gregory not daring to treat William as he had treated Henry, and respecting his superior character, though he remonstrated, did not venture on an open rupture or any public denunciation. His whole character seems to have softened at this time, for his treatment of Berengarius, who



was accused before him of heresy for denying the newly adopted dogma of transubstantiation, which had won its way into the religious world, was mild and just, and it was owing to the favour of the pontiff that Berengarius escaped.—(*See Berengarius.*)

Meantime Henry's affairs improved in Germany, and those of Rudolph declined, until, roused by the reproaches of the latter and his friends, Gregory once more acted with his pristine vigour, and ventured again not only to excommunicate Henry, but to deprive him of his dominions. "I forbid," he said, "all Christians to obey him as king, and I absolve all who have sworn or shall swear allegiance to him," and he, moreover, made a grant of the empire to Rudolph.

Henry retaliated by setting up an anti-pope in Gregory's great enemy Guibert. He soon after was freed from his rival Rudolph, who was killed in battle, and this fact told the more strongly against Gregory, as he had ventured to predict, as if inspired, the death of Henry about that time. The troops also of the Countess Matilda were routed at the same time in Italy. Every thing now turned against Gregory; he was laughed at as a false prophet, and stood almost alone in the contest with his triumphant adversary; the monarchs of Europe, with whom he was on friendly terms, being at a distance, and little able to assist him. At the same time, the married clergy, whom he had insulted, got up a cry against him, as a heretic, because in the affair of Berengarius, he seemed to be opposed to the dogma of transubstantiation.

The spirit of Gregory rose with his trials: he felt that he suffered because he had attempted to reform the Church, and his conscience, so far, was at rest, although he admitted that his calamities were the just reward of many sins. Henry ruled Italy, and approached Rome with a large army, but Gregory would make no concessions: the combat was for a principle, whether the civil or the ecclesiastical authority should be supreme, and to

his principle Gregory was firm. For two years he defied the king, who was in possession of almost all Italy, and who in his third campaign became master of the greater part of Rome; but it was not till 1084 that Henry completely triumphed. Guibert, the anti-pope, was consecrated as Clement VIII., and the anti-pope conferred on Henry the imperial diadem. Gregory remained pent up in the castle of St. Angelo. For six months the pontiff remained at St. Angelo, when Robert Guiscard came to his rescue, and before his troops Henry and his anti-pope were compelled to retire. By Guiscard's troops the city of Rome was almost burnt to the ground, and Gregory retired from Rome to the castle of Salerno, where he again excommunicated Henry and the anti-pope. He entered Salerno a worn-out old man, but he still discharged the duties of his office, and gave himself up to devotion and prayer. He disclaimed any right to glory in any thing, but he declared that his whole course was guided by principle. His last words were characteristic: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity: and therefore I die in exile."

His pride was that of principle as well as of temper: in reforming the Church he was zealous but not discreet, and his fanaticism on the subject of clerical celibacy was conducive to the future demoralization of the clergy; in maintaining the independence of the Church he has our sympathy, but he loses it when he seeks to exalt the ecclesiastical into a despotic and tyrannical power. —*Bowden's Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.*

#### HILDERSHAM, ARTHUR.

ARTHUR HILDERSHAM, a Puritan, whose father was nearly related to Cardinal Pole, and consequently to the royal family of England, was born at Stechworth, in Cambridgeshire, in 1563, and educated at Christ's

College, Cambridge ; after which he obtained a fellowship at Trinity Hall. In 1593 he was presented to the living of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, in Leicestershire, where he continued till his death, in 1631. His works are—1. Lectures on John, 1628, fol. 2. Lectures on Psalm 51, fol. 3. A Treatise on the Lord's Supper. He left in MS. a Paraphrase of the whole Bible, from which was extracted a paraphrase on the Song of Solomon, printed in 1672, in 12mo.—*Clark's Lives*.

## HILDESLEY, MARK.

MARK HILDESLEY, was born in 1698, at Murson, near Sittingbourne, in Kent, of which his father was rector, and educated at the Charter House, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. He was ordained deacon in 1722 ; in 1723 was appointed domestic chaplain to Lord Cobham ; and in 1725 he was nominated a preacher at Whitehall, by Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London. In 1731 he was presented by his college to the vicarage of Hitchin, in Hertfordshire ; and in 1735 he succeeded to the neighbouring rectory of Holwell, in the county of Bedford, where for twenty years he discharged the duties of his important function with a truly primitive fidelity, not only by frequent public preaching, but by private visiting, exhortation, and catechizing, distributing religious books, &c. At length his exemplary conduct became known to the Duke of Athol, lord and patron of the Bishopric of Sodor and Man, who considered him as a proper person to succeed the excellent Bishop Wilson, who died in 1755. In 1767 he was presented by the Bishop of Durham to the mastership of Sherburn Hospital ; and he had also a prebend at Lincoln. He devoted himself to the various duties of his episcopal charge with great assiduity, and undertook to execute the arduous task of getting the Holy Scriptures



translated into the Manks language, and printed for the use of the native inhabitants. This had been already begun by Bishop Wilson, who, at his own expense, had proceeded so far as to print the gospel of St. Matthew. This important task lay so near his heart, that he was often heard to say, "he only wished to live to see it finished." And his wish was accomplished; he lived to see the work completed, in consequence of a successful application made to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, who in the most liberal manner espoused the cause. At first, with the sanction and support of the Society, he printed only the New Testament; the Book of Common Prayer translated, under his direction, by the clergy of his diocese; The Christian Monitor; Mr. Lewis's Exposition of the Catechism; and Bishop Wilson's Form of Prayer, for the use of the Herring-fishery. But the benefactions so far exceeded their expectation, that about 1766 they were encouraged to set on foot a Manks translation of the Old Testament. On the 28th of November, 1772, he received the last part of the Bible translation, and according to his own repeated promise, he very emphatically sang, *Nunc, Domine, dimittis*. The next day he officiated and preached in his chapel, his subject being, the uncertainty of human life; he adverted to the same subject at family prayers in the evening. The next day he was seized with a stroke of apoplexy, and died on the 7th of December. He was a man of ardent piety, who meekly followed in the steps of good Bishop Wilson, without his intellectual superiority, and without even fully realizing his principles. He wrote only one book, Plain Instructions for Young Persons in the Principles of the Christian Religion. His life was written by the Rev. Weeden Butler, and is a most curious specimen of book-making. From the seven hundred pages of this volume nothing has been found worth extracting, and the chief facts are stated in this article.

## HELDUIN.

HELDUIN was abbot of St. Medard at Soissons, of St. Germain and St. Denys, near Paris, and was chief chaplain to Louis le Debonnaire. In the last-mentioned of these monasteries he made a reformation in 829, and settled monks there instead of canons. He sided with Lothaire against his father, and was banished into Saxony. But he was restored after a time, and readmitted to the favour of Louis. He was the first who confounded St. Denys, or Dionysius, Bishop of Paris, with Dionysius the Areopagite, in his Life of St. Dionysius, entitled, *Areopagitica*, Paris, 1565, which is replete with fabulous absurdities. He is said to have died in 838, or 842.—*Dupin. Moreri.*

## HINCHLIFFE, JOHN.

JOHN HINCHLIFFE was the son of a stable keeper in Swallow-street, St. James's, and born in 1731. He had his education in Westminster School, from whence he was elected to Trinity College, Cambridge; after which he became successively usher and master of the seminary where he had been bred. Before the last appointment he travelled with Mr. Crewe, of Cheshire, whose sister he married. In 1768 he was made master of Trinity College, through the interest of the Duke of Grafton, who, when prime minister, advanced him to the bishopric of Peterborough, with which he held the deanery of Durham to his death in 1794. He published three sermons; and a posthumous volume of his discourses was printed in 1796. Jones of Nayland, in his life of Bishop Horne, says that "he spake with the accent of a man of sense, (such as he really was in a superior degree;) but it was remarkable, and to those who did

not know the cause, mysterious, that there was not a corner of the church in which he could not be heard distinctly." Jones accounts for the fact by stating, that he made it an invariable rule "to do justice to every consonant, knowing that the vowels will be sure to speak for themselves. And thus he became the surest and clearest of speakers ; his elocution was perfect, and never disappointed his audience."—*Gent. Mag.*

## HINCKLEY, JOHN.

JOHN HINCKLEY, was born in Warwickshire, in 1617. He studied at St. Alban Hall, Oxford, where he proceeded to the degree of doctor of divinity on obtaining the rectory of Northfield, in Worcestershire. He died in 1695. He published, Four Sermons: viz. 1. at the assizes at Reading; 2. at Abingdon: 3. and 4. at Oxford, 1657; Matrimonial Instruction to Persons of honour, printed with the Four Sermons; *Epistola veridica ad Homines φιλοπρωτευοντας*, 1659; *Oratio pro Statu Ecclesiæ fluctuantis*; A Persuasive to Conformity, by way of letter to the dissenting brethren; *Fasciculus Literarum*, or Letters on several occasions, written by Richard Baxter and Dr. Hinckley on the Divisions in the Church.—*Wood. Nichols.*

## HINCMAR.

HINCMAR, 32nd Bishop of Rheims, was learned for the time in which he lived, and was one of the ornaments of the French Church. He was born at the commencement of the ninth century, of an illustrious family, being related to Birman II. count of Toulouse; in his childhood he was placed in the abbey of St. Denis, to be trained in science and in piety, by Hildwin, abbot of the the monastery,



where he assumed a canonical habit. Having finished his studies, he was summoned to the court of Louis le Debonnaire, where he distinguished himself by his talents, and by the cultivation of his mind. He was fortunate enough to obtain the favour of the monarch. The first use which he made of this influence, was to beg of the king the reform of the monastery of St. Denis, which had fallen into disorder. As soon as discipline was restored he went there, and became a monk, submitting to all the renewed austerities of the order. The emperor having recalled him to court, he remained there till the death of that prince, and was still employed under Charles the Bald. In 845, a council of the two sees of Rheims and Sens was assembled at Beauvais, where it was judged necessary to fill up the see of Rheims, which had been vacant ten years, owing to the deposition of the last archbishop.—Hincmar was unanimously elected by the clergy and people of Rheims, with the consent of the king; and on the 3rd of May in the same year, he was consecrated by Rothadus, Bishop of Soissons, and metropolitan. Benedict III. and Nicholas I. approved of this election, and it was confirmed by the council of Meaux in 847. It was in the following year that the difference took place between Hincmar and Gotteschalcus, a Benedictine of the abbey of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons, on the subject of the two predestinations. This ecclesiastic had already been condemned by the council of Mayence, and sent to Hincmar, his metropolitan. In a council of three bishops, assembled at the castle of Querci in Picardy, the unhappy Gotteschalcus was examined in his doctrine, in the presence of Charles the Bald, and was condemned for the second time, and put in a dungeon, where he remained for the rest of his life. This judgment did not receive universal approbation. Among other learned and holy persons who blamed Hincmar's severity, were Loupus, abbot of Ferrieres, St. Prudentius the younger, Bishop of Troyes, and even the

Church of Lyons. This was not the only instance in which the decision of Hincmar was called in question; he had the mortification to see Pope Nicholas uphold the ordination of Vulfadus and other clergy, whom he had deposed because they had been ordained by Ebbonius, his predecessor. Hincmar was not more fortunate in his judgment against Rothadus, Bishop of Soissons, by whom he had been ordained; to satisfy a private dislike he had deposed him, and removed him to a convent, because the bishop had punished, according to the canons, one of his priests, convicted of a capital crime. This judgment was annulled by Nicholas, to whom Rothaldus had applied.

His conduct towards his nephew Hincmar, notwithstanding the faults of the latter, is not exempt from the reproach of hardness and even cruelty. Perhaps on this occasion he served too much as a courtier the resentment of the king, which, as an uncle and an archbishop, he should have softened. And it is a pity that he gave judgment in such a cause. But setting aside this, Hincmar was not quite without all episcopal virtues. There is nothing to reproach him for in his pastoral duties; he knew how to maintain discipline in his diocese, and how to encourage a taste for ecclesiastical studies among his clergy. He considerably increased the library of his church. Ebbonius had begun to build a cathedral, Hincmar finished it, and ornamented it beautifully; and he extended his benevolent care and munificence to the monastery of Saint Remi, of which he was abbot. He had been present at nearly all the councils during his episcopate; when he became archbishop he continued to live as a monk, and, faithful to the rule of St. Benedict, he kept all his life to the abstinence which he prescribed.

The Normans having made an irruption into Champagne, Hincmar was obliged to quit Rheims, a town without any defence. He retired into Epernay, taking with him the body of St. Remi, for whom he had a great

respect. Hincmar died in 882, having been thirty-seven years a bishop.

He is the author of many works ; among others, A Treatise on Predestination, against Gotteschalcus ; A Paper on the Divorce of King Lothaire, and the Queen Thietberge ; and, A Collection of Capitulaires. The rest consists in a number of opusculæ. The details are to be found in the Literary History of France.—*Beauchamp. Biog. Univers.*

## HINCMAR.

HINCMAR, nephew of the preceding, by his mother's side, and 22nd Bishop of Laon, was brought up in the Church of Rheims, under the superintendence of his uncle. In his youth he showed signs of having a very obstinate character, which was afterwards the cause of much misery to him. This did not, however, prevent his uncle from bringing him forward, and having him elected Bishop of Laon, although not of the age prescribed by the canons. The precise date of his consecration is unknown, but that it took place before March, 858, is certain, as in that month he assisted in the quality of bishop at the council of Querci. Through his uncle's influence, he obtained the favour of Charles the Bald, and was employed in several honourable missions. At the assembly of Metz, in 859, he was one of the deputies sent to Louis the German, on the subject of his quarrels with his brother. He assisted, in 868, at another assembly held in the same town, on the reconciliation of the two princes. He took part in the councils which occurred between these two epochs, and he also obtained an abbey, and the administration of a royal house. It was only a short time after the last assembly of Metz, that his obstinate character brought him into difficulties.



Whether it was from restlessness, or from a sense of duty, he undertook to restore to his Church certain territories which belonged to some courtiers. He pronounced excommunication at random ; it is said that he once excommunicated all his clergy, and, according to Vellius, the king himself. On account of this strange conduct, he was brought before a council held at Verberci, composed of twenty-nine bishops, at which his uncle Hincmar presided. He was accused and condemned. Having appealed to the pope, he asked permission to go to Rome to carry on his suit, but was refused. He nevertheless succeeded in getting himself restored to favour, and all would have been forgotten, if he had not, the following year, refused six times to sign the condemnation of those who were implicated in the rebellion of Carloman. Having been brought before the council of Douzy again in 871, he was deposed, put in prison, and another bishop appointed in his stead ; to this treatment, which he had certainly merited, was added a most cruel punishment, which admits of no excuse:—his eyes were put out. It is not certain whether Hincmar took part in this cruelty.

John VIII. confirmed the judgment which deposed Hincmar. However, this pope having come to Troyes, Hincmar presented himself before him, and in a touching harangue related his misfortunes. John had pity on him, and although he retained Hernulphus in the bishopric of Lyons, he reinstated Hincmar, and gave him a part of the episcopal revenues, and allowed him to resume his pontifical functions. His friends reinvested him with all the marks of his dignity, and after having brought him before the pope, they took him to church, where he blessed the people. The date of his death is unknown, but it certainly took place before that of his uncle. Hincmar was the author of many books, of which but few have descended to us.—*Beauchamp*.

## HIPPOLYTUS, SAINT.

SAINT HIPPOLYTUS, a Christian bishop and martyr in the third century, is generally distinguished by the surname of Portuensis, it being now a common opinion in the learned world, that he was either bishop of Portus Augusti, in Italy, or of Portus Romanus, now called Aden, in Arabia.

Photius has two articles relating to Hippolytus. In the first he speaks of his book against heresies, which he calls "a little book." He says expressly that Hippolytus was a disciple of Irenæus, and seems to have learnt this from Hippolytus himself. In this book was a confutation of thirty-two heresies, from Dositheus to Noetus and the Noetians. Hippolytus says, that the same heresies had been confuted by Irenæus, and that he intended his small tract as an abridgment of what Irenæus had said. His style, says Photius, is clear, grave, and concise, without aiming however at Attic purity and elegance. Nevertheless he advances some things which are not right: particularly he says, that the epistle to the Hebrews is not the apostle Paul's. Photius adds, that Hippolytus is said to have written many other pieces. This very much confirms the supposition, that Irenæus did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's.

In the other place, Photius gives an account of his commentary upon Daniel, and the discourse of Christ and Antichrist; and calls Hippolytus bishop and martyr. With regard to the style of the former of these, Photius says it is clear, and such as is suitable to a commentary, though it is far from the Attic purity. The character which this great critic gives of our author, though he dislikes and censures some things in him, is enough to make us regret the loss of so many, indeed almost all his works.

The whole of what Photius says of this commentary

upon Daniel is so masterly, and so fine a model of criticism, that it is transcribed by Lardner, Du Pin, and Tillemont. It is not, Photius says, a continued explanation of the prophet; nevertheless he omits nothing material. Many things are here expressed after the manner of the ancients, not with the exactness of latter ages. But there is no reason to blame him on that account: for it would be unjust to find fault with those who have laid the foundations of any science, that they have not brought it to perfection; we ought rather to think ourselves obliged to them for their good endeavours, and leaving us such helps for farther improvement. But that he determines the appearance of Antichrist (at which time he also fixes the end of this visible world) to the year 500 from Christ, and the completion of 6000 years from the creation of the world; this is rather a mark of a warm fancy than of discretion, since Christ Himself would not satisfy the disciples about such matters, though they desired Him. This determination therefore is to be imputed to human ignorance, not to illumination from above.

He is supposed to have suffered martyrdom at, or near Rome, about 240. In 1551 there was discovered near Tivoli a marble statue, representing a venerable person sitting in a chair, on the sides of which are engraved, in Greek letters, cycles of sixteen years, forming the most ancient paschal canon in existence. It was published in Greek by Joseph Scaliger, with commentaries, in 1595; and in Latin, by father Giles Bucher, in 1634. Gruter has also inserted it in his Collection of Ancient Inscriptions. Though there is no name upon this monument, yet from a catalogue which is also engraved upon it, of the titles of different works, there is sufficient reason for concluding that it was erected to the memory of Hippolytus. Several of these works are the same with those attributed to him by Eusebius and Jerome. John Albert Fabricius published a very valuable edition of the remain-



ing works and fragments of Hippolytus, in Greek and Latin, in 2 vols, fol., 1716 and 1718. They consist of The Paschal Canon ; De Antichristo Liber ; De Susannâ et Daniele ; and, Demonstratio adversus Judæos ; together with some fragments of a Commentary on Genesis. Mill intended to publish the works of Hippolytus, but died before he could accomplish the undertaking.

## HOADLEY, BENJAMIN.

BENJAMIN HOADLEY was born at Westerham in Kent, in 1676. He was educated under his father, who was at that time master of the Grammar School at Norwich. His university was Cambridge ; his college Catherine Hall, where he matriculated in 1691. He took his B.A. degree in 1695 and his M.A. in 1699, having been ordained deacon in 1698 : in 1700 he was ordained priest, and in the following year was appointed to the lectureship of St. Mildred in the Poultry. His talents were not perhaps very popular, as at the end of ten years he says himself that he had “preached the lectureship down to £30. per annum,” and as his only notion of preaching seems to have been to make money, when the income had been so reduced he resigned it. In 1702 he officiated for a short time as curate to the rector of St. Swithin’s, and two years afterwards was presented to the rectory of St. Peter-le-Poor in Old Broad Street. He seems at first to have speculated on orthodoxy, for he owed this preferment to Dr. Sherlock, the dean of St. Paul’s, and he published, in 1703, a treatise, entitled, The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England represented to the Dissenting Ministers, in answer to the tenth chapter of Mr. Calamy’s abridgment of Mr. Baxter’s Life and Times, 8vo. A controversy ensued, in which Hoadley maintained his cause with vigour, and there is a work of his on

Episcopacy, which may even now be read with advantage. But the whigs were in power, and their hatred of Church principles being strong, Hoadley soon perceived that the way to preferment was to assail the Church and undermine the principles of Christianity. He proceeded, however, cautiously. His object was first to establish a position for himself as a political martyr.

On September 29th, 1705, he dealt the first blow, in a sermon he preached before the lord mayor. This sermon was noticed by the lower house of convocation: having addressed the upper house on other subjects, they observe that "They do in the last place earnestly desire your lordships, that some synodical notice may be taken of the dishonour done to the Church by a sermon preached by Mr. Benjamin Hoadley, at St. Lawrence Jewry, Sept. 29, 1705, containing positions contrary to the doctrine of the Church, expressed in the first and second parts of the Homily against disobedience or wilful rebellion."

This was what he desired: the whig ministry determined upon his preferment, and Hoadley plunged at once into controversy in their favour, and against the Christian religion. He defended his sermon, in a piece entitled *The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered*, in a defence of the doctrine delivered in a Sermon, &c., 8vo. In 1706 he entered the lists against Atterbury, calling him to task for his funeral sermon for Mr. Bennet. Atterbury had in some degree laid himself open to attack, but Hoadley was not the man who had sufficient moral power to be the assailant. He was capacious, and too evidently shewed that he merely wished to obtain favour with the government by attacking an opponent upon a weak point. Hoadley's attack was made in a letter addressed to Bishop Atterbury, which drew from the prelate a long vindication, in the form of a preface to a volume of his sermons. In reply to this preface,

Hoadley, in 1708, published a second letter to the bishop, with a postscript, relating to his doctrine concerning the power of charity to cover sins. Hoadley was fully bent on becoming a champion for the whigs against the few orthodox bishops on the bench, and he now assailed Dr. Blackall, Bishop of Exeter, to whom he addressed some Considerations, occasioned by a sermon preached by his lordship before the queen in 1708. To these Considerations the bishop published an answer, which was soon followed by a reply from Hoadley, which was sarcastically styled, a Humble Reply: humility being a virtue of which Hoadley was ignorant. In 1709 he again attacked Atterbury, who, in his *Concio ad Clerum Londinensem*, had maintained the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. So well did Hoadley play his cards, that a whig majority in the house of commons represented, in an address to the queen, the signal services which he had rendered to the cause of civil and religious liberty, requesting that her majesty would be graciously pleased to bestow upon him some dignity in the Church. But this extraordinary interference was without effect. But in 1710 he was presented by Mrs. Howland, grandmother of the Duke of Bedford, to the rectory of Streatham, in Surrey, and was honoured with a chaplaincy by his grace, as a qualification for holding it. In 1711 he published his discourses on the Terms of Acceptance with God. Not long after he published a satire, under the name of Sir Richard Steele, in the form of a dedication to pope Clement IX. prefixed to *An Account of the State of the Roman Catholic Religion throughout the world*. Soon after the accession of George I. Hoadley was nominated one of his chaplains, having, before his admission to that office, been created D.D. by Archbishop Wake. In 1715 he was made Bishop of Bangor; and such was the extreme absence of principle in Hoadley, so entirely void was he of any sense of responsibility, that he never visited his diocese. The flock of the Welsh bishop might



starve ; their chief pastor had other business to perform : he had to indulge his controversial temper, and to push his fortunes further, which could only be done in London. In 1716 he published *A Preservative against the Principles and Practice of the nonjurors both in Church and State, or an Appeal to the consciences and common sense of the Christian Laity*. On the 31st of March in the ensuing year, 1717, Bishop Hoadley preached a sermon before the king on John xviii. 36 : “ Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world.” This Sermon and the *Preservative*, both being framed on the same principles, were justly obnoxious, not only to the nonjurors, but to all honest members of the Church of England, who despised the flattery addressed to the Lutheran profligate on the throne and his ministers, reckless of every thing but the preservation of the dynasty, on which the preservation of their places depended. The subject of the bishop’s sermon was discussed in the lower house of convocation, when convocation exercised a proper control over the episcopate, and before bishops, by the cessation of convocation, had become despotic. Mosse, Sherlock, Cannon, Davies, Friend, Bisse, Dawson, Spratt, and Burrell, were appointed to draw up a report. They entered upon their task upon the 3rd of May, and on the tenth the following report was submitted to the house :—

*“ A representation of the lower house of convocation about the Bishop of Bangor’s sermon of the kingdom of Christ. [May 3, 1717.]*

*“ To his grace the lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the lords the bishops of the province of Canterbury in convocation assembled.*

“ Humbly sheweth,

“ That with much grief of heart we have observed, what in all dutiful manner we now represent to your

grace and your lordships, that the right reverend the lord bishop of Bangor hath given great and grievous offence by certain doctrines and positions by him lately published partly in a sermon entituled, 'The nature of the kingdom or Church of Christ,' and partly in a book, entituled, 'A preservative against the principles, and practices of the nonjurors both in church and state.'

"The tendency of the doctrines and positions contained in the said sermon and book is conceived to be

"I. First, to subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, and to reduce His kingdom to a state of anarchy and confusion.

"II. Secondly, to impugn and impeach the regal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion by civil sanctions.

"The passages in the sermon and book aforesaid, which are conceived to carry the evil tendency expressed under the first article, are principally these that follow :

"I. [Sermon.] At page 11, octavo edition, his lordship affirms,—'As the Church of Christ is the kingdom of Christ, He Himself is King ; and in this it is implied, that He is Himself the sole lawgiver to His subjects, and Himself the sole Judge of their behaviour in the affairs of conscience and eternal salvation. And in this sense therefore His kingdom is not of this world ; that He hath in those points left behind Him no visible, human authority ; no vicegerents, who can be said properly to supply His place ; no interpreters, upon whom His subjects are absolutely to depend, no judges over the consciences or religion of His people.' This passage seems to deny authority to the Church, and under pretence of exalting the kingdom of Christ, to leave it without any visible human authority to judge, censure, or punish offenders in the affairs of conscience and eternal salvation.

“ Which will be confirmed by the passage next to be produced, pag. 15, 16.

“ ‘ If therefore the Church of Christ be the kingdom of Christ, it is essential to it, that Christ Himself be the sole Lawgiver and sole Judge of His subjects in all points relating to the favour or displeasure of Almighty God ; and that all His subjects, in what station soever they may be, are equally subjects to Him ; and that no one of them, any more than another, hath authority either to make new laws for Christ’s subjects, or to impose a sense upon the old ones, which is the same thing ; or to judge, censure, or punish the servants of another master in matters relating purely to conscience or salvation. If any person hath any other notion either through a long use of words with inconsistent meanings, or through a negligence of thought ; let him but ask himself, whether the Church of Christ be the kingdom of Christ, or not ? and if it be, whether this notion of it doth not absolutely exclude all other legislators and judges in matters relating to conscience or the favour of God ? or whether it can be His kingdom, if any mortal men have such a power of legislation and judgment in it ? ’

“ To the same sense he speaks page 25. ‘ No one of His subjects is lawgiver and judge over others of them in matters relating to salvation, but He alone.’

“ If the doctrine contained in these passages be admitted, there neither is nor hath been since our Saviour’s time any authority in the Christian Church in matters relating to conscience and salvation, not even in the apostles themselves ; but all acts of government in such cases have been an invasion of Christ’s authority, and an usurpation upon His kingdom.

“ To which effect his lordship further expresses himself page 14.—‘ When they (i. e. any men on earth) make any of their own declarations or decisions to concern and affect the state of Christ’s subjects with regard to the



favour of God ; this is so far the taking Christ's kingdom out of His hands, and placing it in their own. Nor is this matter at all made better by their declaring themselves to be vicegerents, or lawmakers, or judges under Christ, in order to carry on the ends of His kingdom.'

" Which words are not restrained to such decisions, as are inconsistent with the doctrines of the gospel ; as appears not only from the general manner, in which he hath expressed himself, but from his direct words page 15.—' And whether they happen to agree with Him, or to differ from Him, as long as they are the lawgivers and judges, without any interposition from Christ either to guide or correct their decisions, they are the kings of this kingdom, and not Christ Jesus.'

" Whether these passages exclude the sacred writers as well as others from making decisions, and interpreting the laws of Christ, your lordships will judge by a passage page 12.—' Nay whoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he, who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person, who first wrote or spoke them.' When a distinction is made between the interpreters of the written and spoken law, the sacred writers only can be meant by the latter. Others have had the written law, they only of all interpreters heard it spoke by Christ ; and his lordship has left us only this choice, either to deny their authority to interpret the laws of Christ, or to charge them with setting up for themselves in opposition to their master.

" These doctrines naturally tend to breed in the minds of the people a disregard to those, who are appointed to rule over them. Whether his lordship had this view, the following passages will declare page 25. 'The Church of Christ is the number of persons, who are sincerely and willingly subjects to Him, as Lawgiver and Judge, in all matters truly relating to conscience or eternal salvation. And the more close and immediate

this regard to Him is, the more certainly and the more evidently true it is, that they are of His kingdom.' And page 31. 'If Christ be our King, let us shew ourselves subjects to Him alone in the great affair of conscience and eternal salvation; and without fear of man's judgment live and act, as becomes those, who wait for the appearance of an all-knowing and impartial Judge, even that King, Whose kingdom is not of this world.'

"To these doctrines his lordship's description of the Church doth well agree. He asserts page 17. 'That it is the number of men, whether small or great, whether dispersed or united, who truly and sincerely are subjects to Jesus Christ alone, as their Lawgiver and Judge, in matters relating to the favour of God and their eternal salvation:' and page 24. 'The grossest mistakes in judgment about the nature of Christ's kingdom or Church have arisen from hence, that men have argued from other visible societies, and other visible kingdoms of this world, to what ought to be visible and sensible in His kingdom:' and page 25. 'We must not frame our ideas from the kingdoms of this world of what ought to be in a visible and sensible manner in His kingdom.'

"Against such arguings from visible societies and earthly kingdoms, his lordship says, our Saviour hath positively warned us; [page 25.]—and yet the scripture representations of the Church do plainly express its resemblance to other societies in many respects, and we presume his lordship could not be ignorant of the nineteenth article of our Church, entituled, 'of the Church,' viz. 'The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all things, that of necessity are requisite to the same.' Though in disparagement of this article by himself solemnly and often acknowledged, he asserts page 10. 'That the notion of the Church hath been so diversified by the various alterations

it hath undergone, that it is almost impossible so much as to number up the many inconsistent images, that have come by daily additions to be united together in it.'

"We wish, that in his lordship's account no images necessary to form a just and true notion of the Church had been left out. He omits even to mention the preaching the word, or administering the sacraments; one of which, in the words of the twenty-seventh article of our Church, is a "sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they, that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church.' We could wish also, that his lordship, whilst he was writing on the subject of the power of the Church, had remembered his solemn profession made at his consecration, in which he promised 'by the help of God to correct and punish according to such authority, as he hath by God's word, and as should be committed to him by the ordinance of this realm, such, as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminal in his diocese.'

"Your grace and your lordships have seen the tendency of the doctrine in the sermon to throw all ecclesiastical authority out of the Church. We now proceed to shew, that the doctrines before delivered in the 'Preservative,' &c. have the same tendency.

"Where, not to trouble your lordships with the contempt thrown on the regular succession of the ministry, and of your own order in particular, for which his lordship has found no better words, than trifles, niceties, dreams, inventions of men, &c. we observe, that as in the sermon all rulers and judges in the visible Church are laid aside, so in the book all Church communion is rendered unnecessary, in order to intitle men to the favour of God; and every man is referred in these cases to his private judgment, as that which will justify even the worst choice he can make.

"Which strange opinion his lordship grounds on what he calls 'a demonstration in the strictest sense of the



word' in a paragraph pag. 89, 90, which is indeed nothing but the common and known case of an erroneous conscience, which was never till now allowed wholly to justify men in their errors, or in throwing off all the authority of lawful governors. For this is putting all communions on an equal foot, without regard to any intrinsic goodness, or whether they be right or wrong, and making every man, how illiterate and ignorant soever, his own sole judge and director on earth in the affair of religion.

“The use his lordship intends from this doctrine is expressed page 90. ‘Every one may find it in his own conduct to be true, that his title to God’s favour cannot depend upon his actual being, or continuing in any particular method, but upon his real sincerity in the conduct of his conscience and of his own actions under it:’ and in page 91 is laid down this general proposition: ‘The favour of God follows sincerity, considered as such, and consequently equally follows every equal degree of sincerity.’

“If sincerity as such (i. e. mere sincerity) exclusive of the truth or falsehood of the doctrine or opinion, be alone sufficient for salvation, or to intitle a man to the favour of God; if no one method of religion be in itself preferable to another; the conclusion must be, that all methods are alike in respect to salvation or the favour of God.

“His lordship himself, in a point of the tenderest concern, has applied this principle to the whole reformation, and in virtue of it has left no difference between the popish and our reformed Church, but what is founded in personal persuasion only, and not in the truth of the doctrines, or in the excellency of one communion above the other. The place we refer to, is at page 85.—‘What is it, that justified the protestants—in setting up their own bishops? Was it, that the popish doctrines and worship were actually corrupt; or that the protestants were persuaded in their own consciences, that they

were so? The latter without doubt; as appears from this demonstration. Take away from them this persuasion; they are so far from being justified, that they are condemned for their departure. Give them this persuasion again; they are condemned, if they do not separate. Or in another manner: suppose a papist, not persuaded of that corruption, to separate; he is, for the want of that persuasion alone, condemned: suppose a protestant, or one thoroughly persuaded of that corruption, to separate; and he is justified in so doing; or not to separate, and he is condemned.' From this pretended demonstration his lordship infers: 'If this were duly and impartially considered, it would be impossible for men to unchristian, unchurch, or declare out of God's favour, any of their fellow creatures upon any lesser, or indeed any other consideration, than that of a wicked dishonesty and insincerity, of which in these cases God alone is judge.'

"If it be true, that there is but one consideration, viz. that of wicked dishonesty and insincerity, which will justify unchristianing, unchurching, or declaring out of God's favour, and of that one consideration in these cases God alone is judge; there is evidently an end of all Church authority to oblige any to external communion, and of all power, that one man, in what station soever, can have over another in matters of religion: and this will shew, what his lordship's true meaning is under the many colours and disguises he makes use of, when he speaks of excommunication; and that he does not write more against the abuse, than the use of it.

"Your lordships will judge from hence, what view he has in pronouncing at page 101. 'Human benedictions, human absolutions, human denunciations, human excommunications have nothing to do with the favour or anger of God:' and in treating them as human engines permitted to work for a time (like other evils) by providence (page 101.) as mere outcries of human terror (page 99.) as the terrors of men, and vain words (page 98.)

“ How his lordship can consistently with these opinions make good his solemn promise made at his consecration, ‘ to be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to do the same ;’ and how he can exercise the high office intrusted to him in the Church, or convey holy orders to others, are difficulties, which himself only can resolve, and we humbly hope your grace and your lordships will think it proper to call for the explication.

“ In maintenance of the second article we offer your lordships the following particulars :

“ That whereas his majesty is, and by the statutes of this realm is declared to be, supreme head of the Church ; and it is by the statute 1 Elizabeth cap. i. enacted, ‘ that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual and ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall for ever by authority of this present parliament be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm :’ in consequence of which the kings and queens of this realm have frequently issued forth their proclamations, injunctions, and directions in matters of religion ; and particular his majesty, that now is, did issue his directions for preserving of unity in the Church, and the purity of the Christian faith concerning the holy Trinity, bearing date December 11, 1714, Georgii primo ; yet his lordship in contradiction to this affirms, page 14. (sermon) ‘ If any men upon earth have a right to add to the sanctions of His (i. e. Christ’s) laws, that is, to increase the number, or alter the nature of the rewards and punishments of His subjects in matters of conscience



or salvation ; they are so far kings in His stead, and reign in their own kingdoms, and not in His :’ and to the same purpose, page 18.—‘The sanctions of Christ’s law are rewards and punishments : but of what sort ? not the rewards of this world ; not the offices or glories of this state ; not the pains of prisons, banishments, fines, or any lesser or more moderate penalties ; nay, not the much lesser negative discouragements, that belong to human society. He was far from thinking, that these could be the instruments of such a persuasion, as he thought acceptable to God.’

“And whereas the Scripture, and our own liturgy from thence, has taught us to pray for kings, and all that are put in authority under them, that they may minister justice to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of true religion and virtue ; his lordship asserts, page 20. (sermon) ‘As soon as ever you hear of any of the engines of this world, whether of the greater or the lesser sort, you must immediately think, that then, and so far, the kingdom of this world takes place. For if the very essence of God’s worship be spirit and truth ; if religion be virtue and charity under the belief of a supreme Governor and Judge ; if true real faith cannot be the effect of force ; and if there can be no reward, where there is no willing choice ; then in all, or any of these cases to apply force or flattery, worldly pleasure or pain, is to act contrary to the interests of true religion, as it is plainly opposite to the maxims, upon which Christ founded His kingdom ; Who chose the motives, which are not of this world, to support a kingdom, which is not of this world.’

“The two first cases here mentioned relate to what is essential in the worship of God and religion ; yet he declares, that to encourage religion by temporal rewards, is to act contrary to the interest of true religion, as it is opposite to the maxims, on which Christ founded His kingdom. This is to set the worship of God and the

neglect of it, religion and irreligion, on an equal foot in this world, as if, because they shall hereafter be distinguished by rewards and punishments by the great Judge, therefore the magistrate was excluded from interposing with rewards and punishments to distinguish them here, and tied up from expressing any concern for His honour, by whom and under whom he beareth rule.

“ This his lordship further supports, page 22.—‘ And therefore when you see our Lord in His methods so far removed from those of many of His disciples ; when you read nothing in his doctrine about His own kingdom, of taking in the concerns of this world, and mixing them with those of eternity ; no commands, that the frowns and discouragements of this present state should in any case attend upon conscience and religion ;——no calling upon the secular arm, whenever the magistrate should become Christian, to enforce His doctrines, or to back His spiritual authority ; but on the contrary, as plain a declaration, as a few words can make, that His kingdom is not of this world ; I say, when you see this from the whole tenor of the gospel, so vastly opposite to many, who take His name into their mouths ; the question with you ought to be, whether He did not know the nature of His own kingdom or Church better, than any since His time ? whether you can suppose, He left any such matters to be decided against Himself, and His own express professions ?’ Where your lordships will observe, that all laws for the encouragement of religion, or discouragement of irreligion are reckoned to be decisions against Christ.

“ The passages produced under this head, are as destructive of the legislative power, as of the real supremacy ; but the acts for uniformity of public prayer, and the articles for establishing of consent touching true religion, which in the last of the said acts are enjoined to be subscribed by the several decrees of persons ecclesiastical, being the main fence and security of the estab-

lished Church of England, they seem to be singled out by his lordship to be rendered odious. The passage we refer to, is to be found page 27—29. (sermon) ‘There are some professed Christians, who contend openly for such an authority, as indispensably obliges all around them to unity of profession, that is, to profess even what they do not, what they cannot, believe to be true. This sounds so grossly, that others, who think they act a glorious part in opposing such an enormity, are very willing for their own sakes, to retain such an authority, as shall oblige men, whatever they themselves think, though not to profess what they do not believe, yet to forbear the profession and publication of what they do believe, let them believe it of never so great importance. Both these pretensions are founded upon the mistaken notion of the peace, as well as authority of the kingdom, that is, the Church of Christ. Which of them is the most insupportable to an honest and a Christian mind, I am not able to say; because they both equally found the authority of the Church of Christ upon the ruins of sincerity and common honesty, and mistake stupidity and sleep for peace; because they would both equally have prevented all reformation, where it hath been, and will for ever prevent it, where it is not already; and in a word, because both equally divest Jesus Christ of His empire in His own kingdom, set the obedience of His subjects loose from Himself, and teach them to prostitute their consciences at the feet of others, who have no right in such a manner to trample upon them.’

“If your lordships consider by what authority the acts of uniformity were enacted, by whom the articles were made, and by whom ratified and confirmed, you will discern, who they are that are said to ‘divest Jesus Christ of His empire in His own kingdom,’ and stand charged by his lordship in the indecent language of ‘trampling’ upon the consciences of others.

“Your lordships have now seen under the first head,



that the Church hath no governors, no censures, no authority over the conduct of men, in matters of conscience and religion; you have seen under the second head, that the temporal powers are excluded from any right to encourage true religion, or to discourage the contrary.

“But to do justice to his lordship’s scheme, and to set it before you in its full light, we must observe, that he further asserts, that Christ Himself (the only power not yet excluded) never doth interpose in the direction of His kingdom here. After observing, page 13, (sermon) that temporal lawgivers do often interpose to interpret their own laws, he adds: ‘But it is otherwise in religion, or the kingdom of Christ. He Himself never interposeth, since His first promulgation of His law, either to convey infallibility to such, as pretend to handle it over again, or to assert the true interpretation of it amidst the various and contradictory opinions of men about it.’ To the same purpose he speaks at page 15 in a passage before recited.

“Since then there are in the Church no governors left: in the state, none, who may intermeddle in the affairs of religion; and since Jesus Christ Himself never doth interpose; we leave it to your grace and your lordships to judge, whether the Church and kingdom of Christ be not reduced to a mere state of anarchy and confusion, in which every man is left to do what is right in his own eyes.

“And we beg leave to close these observations in the words of the thirty-fourth article of our Church: ‘Who-soever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break (much more teach and encourage others to break) the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like) as one, that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.’

“Having thus laid before your grace and your lordships the several passages, upon which this our humble representation is grounded, together with our observations on them, we must profess ourselves to be equally surprised and concerned, that doctrines of so evil a tendency should be advanced by a bishop of this established Church, and that too in a manner so very remarkable; that the supremacy of the king should be openly impeached in a sermon delivered in the royal audience; and that the constitution of the Church should be dangerously undermined in a book professedly written against the principles and practices of some, who had departed from it.

“But so it hath happened: this right reverend bishop in his extreme opposition to certain unwarrantable pretensions to extravagant degrees of Church power, seems to have been so far transported beyond his temper and his argument, as not only to condemn the abuse, but even to deny the use, and to destroy the being of those powers, without which the Church, as a society, cannot subsist, and by which our national constitution, next under Christ, is chiefly supported. Under these apprehensions, we could not but hold ourselves obliged to represent our own sense, with that of our brethren of the clergy, to your lordships, and to submit the whole to your much weightier judgment, which we do as with the most unfeigned sorrow for the unhappy occasion, and all becoming deference to our superiors, so with the most sincere and disinterested zeal, and with no other view in the world, but to give a check to the propagation of these erroneous opinions, so destructive of all government and discipline in the Church, and so derogatory to the royal supremacy, and legislative authority, as, we presume, may have been sufficiently evinced. Of our honest and loyal intentions, we doubt not but your lordships in your known goodness will favourably apprise his majesty,

if it shall be thought needful or expedient, in order to set this matter, together with our proceedings thereupon, in a true and proper light.

“ We are by no means insensible, that there are divers other offensive passages in the sermon and book above mentioned, which we for the present omit, as not falling so directly under the two heads proposed ; nor are we ignorant, that several offensive books have of late time been published by other writers, whose confidence doth loudly call for the animadversions of the synod ; to which also we shall be ready to contribute our endeavours. But we apprehended this to be a case very singular and extraordinary, such as deserved a separate consideration, that a bishop of this Church should in his writings make void and set at nought those very powers, with which he himself is invested, and which by virtue of his office he is bound to exercise ; in particular as often as he confers holy orders, institutes to any ecclesiastical benefice, or inflicts spiritual censures : nor were we less apprehensive, that the eminence of his lordship’s station and character, as it aggravates the scandal, would also help to spread the ill influence further and faster, under that colour of argument, with which he endeavours to cover these his pernicious tenets.

“ If your grace and your lordships, after having maturely weighed the premises, shall find just cause for the complaints, which have given rise to this representation, we rest assured, that in your godly zeal and great wisdom you will not fail to enter upon some speedy and effectual method to vindicate the honour of God and religion, that hath been so deeply wounded, to assert the prerogative given to all godly princes in holy scripture, that hath been so manifestly invaded, and to resettle those weak and wavering minds, which may have been ensnared or perplexed by any of the unsound doctrines taught and published by this right reverend bishop. Which your lordships’ pious counsels and endeavours will be attended



with the united prayers of us, our brethren, whom we represent, and of all good Christian people.”

Before this representation could be brought into the upper house, the convocation was tyrannically prorogued by a special order from the king, and was not permitted to sit again until the contest had subsided. It has never since been allowed to enter upon any business of consequence, and our bishops, uncontrolled by the Church, have armed themselves with acts of parliament, and have constituted themselves popes.

Hence originated the famous Bangorian controversy, of which a history is greatly needed. It commenced with a letter from Dr. Snape to the Bishop of Bangor. Snape was followed by Sherlock, Hare, Potter, and especially by that acute and formidable disputant, William Law, who especially triumphed over Hoadley, and whose answer to him is still a standard work. The controversy was hardly brought to a conclusion in 1720, when the non-resident pluralist bishop resigned the rectory of St. Peter-le-Poor; and in the following year he was translated from the see of Bangor, which for six years he had never visited, to that of Hereford. In 1723 he was translated to the see of Salisbury, upon which he resigned the rectory of Streatham. In 1732 he drew up, *An Account of the Life, Writings, and Character of Dr. Samuel Clarke*, which was prefixed to the posthumous works of that writer, then first published. In 1734 he was advanced, on the death of Bishop Willis, whom he had also succeeded at Salisbury, to the see of Winchester; and in the following year he published, “*A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, in which all the Texts of the New Testament relating to it are produced and explained, and the whole Doctrine about it is drawn from them alone.” This miserable work, which is an attempt to overthrow the truths of Christianity by an appeal to Scripture, has been completely and ably refuted by the bishop’s old

antagonist, Mr. Law, to whom the bishop conducted himself with intolerable insolence. The bishop neglected all his duties as Bishop of Winchester, the diocese only now, under the superintendence of its present active diocesan, having recovered from his misrule and the ill example of carelessness and idleness which he set. He visited that diocese only once.

He died at his palace at Chelsea in 1761, in the eighty-fifth year of his age, and was buried in Winchester cathedral, where a monument, with a Latin inscription, written by himself, is erected to his memory.

A complete edition of his long since forgotten works, in 3 vols. folio, was published by his son, Dr. John Hoadley, in 1773, with a short life of the author, originally printed in the *Biographia Britannica*.—*Life by his Son. Cardwell's Synodalia. Lathbury.*

#### HODY, HUMPHREY.

HUMPHREY HODY was born Jan. 1, 1659, at Odcombe, in Somersetshire, of which place his father was rector. In 1676 he was sent to Wadham College, Oxford, of which college he became fellow in 1684, having taken his M. A. degree in June 1682, as he did that of D. D. in February 1692-3.

At the age of twenty-one he published his Dissertation against Aristæus's History of the LXXII. Interpreters, which was received with general applause by the learned world, though Isaac Vossius, who had embraced a different opinion, loaded it with abuse, and ridiculed the author. To this attack from Vossius, inserted in an appendix to his Pomponius Mela, Hody did not deign to give an answer till more than twenty years after, when, in 1704, he published his book, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Versionibus Græcis et Latina Vulgata, &c. Lib. IV., 8vo.* The first book contains his dissertation

against Aristeas's history, with improvements, and an answer to Vossius's objections. In the second, he treats of the true authors of the Greek version, called the Septuagint, of the time when, and the reasons why it was undertaken, and of the manner in which it was performed. The third is a history of the original Hebrew text, of the Greek version called the Septuagint, and of the Latin Vulgate; showing the authority of each in different ages, and that the Hebrew text has been always most esteemed and valued. In the fourth, he gives an account of the rest of the Greek versions, viz. those of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion; of Origen's Hexapla, and other ancient editions; and subjoins lists of the books of the bible at different times, which exhibit a concise, but clear view of the canon of scripture. Upon the whole, he thinks it probable that the Greek version, called the Septuagint, was made in the time of the two Ptolemies, Lagus and Philadelphus, and by Hellenist Jews, for the use of their own countrymen. In 1689 he published his *Prolegomena to Malela's Chronicon*, and the next year he was made chaplain to Bishop Stillingfleet.

Dr. Hody was one of the divines who supported the revolution, and stood prominently opposed to the deprived bishops. In the year 1692 was printed anonymously and privately a work of considerable size, "The Unity of the Priesthood, &c." By Mr. Lathbury, from whose *History of the Nonjurors* the account of this controversy is taken, the work is attributed to Dr. Bisby.

The writer commences by stating, that the appointment of a new archbishop was the occasion of his undertaking: "Of the ill news you have sent me, none sits so close upon me as the news of a new primate and new bishops: the old ones being living, and neither canonically heard, nor judicially deprived: a project utterly dissonant to all primitive practice, to the ancient constitutions and canons of the Church: and which if not timely



compromised, must necessarily beget and perhaps unavoidably propagate a lasting schism among us."

An ancient MS. had been discovered in Oxford, containing a set of canons, which it was thought favoured the case of the new bishops. This MS. was published by Hody, under the following title: "The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the new Bishops: or a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, shewing that although a bishop was originally deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a separation if the successor was not an heretic. Translated out of an ancient MS. in the public library at Oxford, 4to, 1691." In this work, therefore, the aim is to shew that a separation from the Church could not lawfully be made by the deprived bishops, unless the new bishops were guilty of heresy. Hody, however, omitted some of the canons: and the author of the preceding work printed the omissions. He contends that the suppressed canons favour the old bishops, and not the new. He charges Hody with "Shamming the world with part of the MS. for the whole." Hody had said that there was a "*singular providence in the discovery at that juncture:*" and the author hopes that the canons, which he publishes, "*may have as good a title to that singular providence.*" These canons were written in the same hand with the previous portion of the MS., and the author of "The Unity of the priesthood" states, that Hody, as it was alleged, had declined to print them, on the ground that they did not appear to have been written by the same author. It certainly was disingenuous on the part of Hody not to publish the whole of the MS. The suppression led men to suppose, that there was a conviction in his own mind, that they rather opposed than supported this principle.

The canons in question contain the rule, *one God, one Christ, one Bishop*. This point, indeed, was admitted by both parties, and the question was, who were the lawful bishops. The author of the "Unity of the Priesthood"

argues for the deprived bishops, as being the first, and not canonically deprived. "The first bishop (if canonically placed in the see) was ever accounted the *true* and *Catholic*, and the second the *false* and *schismatical* bishop : and the Church was ever adjudged to go along with those, who by a lawful ordination were first set up in it : and the *schism* with those, who were afterwards superinduced and clapt upon them." According to this writer the *ordainers* were the more to be censured. "Those *bishops* I mean that first *dressed up* the *ape*, *set him in the chair*, and bad *God speed* unto him ; hence, though submission and penance might reconcile the other clergy, yet nothing less than utter deprivation and loss of their sacerdotal honours could atone for such." It was argued, by the supporters of the government, that the rejection of the interference of the state in this case involved also the rejection of the proceedings with the bishops, who were deprived at the Reformation. This argument is met in the present work at considerable length. The author alludes to the Book of Common Prayer, which was duly and lawfully set forth by parliament and by convocation : so that on this ground the Romish bishops were lawfully deprived for noncompliance. Other reasons are adduced to prove, that the cases of the bishops, at the Reformation and at the Revolution, were not by any means parallel.

Hody laboured to prove from his ancient MS. that no separation ever took place from a new bishop, even though uncanonically introduced, unless he was guilty of schism. This position was controverted by his opponent, who argues that new bishops must not only be orthodox in faith, but canonically introduced into the vacant see ; that is, a see vacant according to the canons of the Church. Hody replied to the author of the 'Unity of the Priesthood,' in "A Letter to a Friend concerning the Oxford Treatise against Schism, 4to, 1692."

He now met even a more important opponent: Henry Dodwell, one of the most learned men of the age took part in the controversy. Dodwell first assails the MS. for the want of antiquity, since it was not written before the thirteenth century, and was consequently too late as an evidence of facts. He then comes to Hody's principle, that no separation was allowed even though bishops were unjustly deprived. All the cases are examined by Dodwell with his usual ability. A brief account of his arguments is also given in his life. Dodwell built a good deal on the fact, that the deprived bishops asserted *their* rights, and challenged the duty of the people. He also contended that, on St. Cyprian's principles, bishops placed in sees vacant only by the authority of the secular magistrate, were not only schismatics, but *nulli*. He even charges the new bishops with heresy, on the ground that they justified their schism by principles. "When it is defended by principles, it turns into false doctrine." In considering the canons suppressed by Hody, he remarks, that the lay deprivations must be condemned if they are admitted.

Hody published "A Reply to Dodwell," in which the usual arguments are re-stated, with others which had been suggested by the Vindication.

Two years elapsed before Dodwell replied. In the following year, 1695, it appeared under the following title: "A Defence of the Vindication of the deprived bishops. Wherein the case of Abiathar is particularly considered, and the invalidity of lay deprivations is further proved, from the doctrine received under the Old Testament, continued in the first ages of Christianity, and from our own fundamental laws. In a reply to Dr. Hody and another author. To which is annexed the doctrine of the Church of England, concerning the independency of the clergy on the lay-power, as to those rights of theirs which are purely spiritual, reconciled



with our oath of supremacy and the lay deprivations of the Popish bishops in the beginning of the Reformation. By the author of the Vindication of the deprived Bishops. London. 4to. 1695."

Dr. Hody, by the spirit and ability with which he conducted this controversy, established a high character even among many who thought his views incorrect, and very deservedly obtained preferment from the party of juring prelates. Tillotson, the *de facto* Archbishop of Canterbury, made him his domestic chaplain in 1694. He was equally patronized by the next primate, Tenison, at whose request he wrote *Animadversions on Collier's Pamphlets*, who had, with two others, pronounced absolution on Sir William Perkins and Sir John Friend. (*For a full account of this transaction, and the controversy resulting from it, the reader is referred to the Life of Collier.*)

In March 1698, he was appointed regius professor of Greek, in the university of Oxford: and was instituted to the Archdeaconry of Oxford in 1704. In 1701 he bore a part in the controversy about the convocation, and published upon that occasion, "A History of English Councils and Convocations, and of the Clergy's sitting in Parliament, in which is also comprehended the history of parliaments, with an account of our ancient laws." (*See Life of Atterbury.*) He died upon the 20th of January, in the year 1706, and was buried in the chapel of Wadham College, to which he was a great benefactor, by the foundation of ten scholarships of £10 each, for the cultivation of Hebrew and Greek. He left a MS. account of the learned Greeks who had fled to Italy before and after the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, which was published in 1742 under the superintendence of Dr. S. Jebb. He also wrote, *The Resurrection of the (Same) Body asserted*, 8vo., London, 1694. —*Lathbury. Jebb. Birch's Life of Tillotson.*

## HOFFMAN, DANIEL.

DANIEL HOFFMAN was a Lutheran professor at Helmstadt, at the end of the sixteenth century. He engaged in the popular and theological controversies of the times and opposed Beza on the subject of the eucharist. He was censured by an assembly of divines in 1593, and threatened with excommunication if he did not subscribe to the opinions of his persecutors, against whom he published a laboured apology. He died in 1611.

## HOLDSWORTH, RICHARD.

RICHARD HOLDSWORTH, sometimes written Oldsworth, and Oldisworth, a learned English divine, son of Richard Holdsworth, a celebrated preacher at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, was born in 1590, and educated at Newcastle, and at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1620 he was chosen one of the twelve university preachers at Cambridge, and was afterwards chaplain to Sir Henry Hobart, lord chief-justice of the Common Pleas. He next obtained a living in Yorkshire, which he exchanged for the rectory of St. Peter-le-Poor, Old Broad-street, London, where he became a very popular preacher, and was much followed by the Puritans. In 1629 he was chosen professor of divinity at Gresham College. About 1631 he was made a prebendary of Lincoln, and in 1633 archdeacon of Huntingdon. In 1637 he was elected Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and in 1639 he was elected President of Sion College. In 1641 he resigned his professorship at Gresham College; and the rebellion having now begun, he was marked out as one of the sacrifices to popular prejudice. When, however, the Assembly of Divines was called, he was nominated one of the number, but he never

sat among them. Soon after, in consequence of his loyalty, he was apprehended near London, and imprisoned, first in Ely House, and then in the Tower. Such was the regard, however, in which he was held at Cambridge, that while under confinement he was elected Margaret professor of divinity, which he held until his death. But his rectory of St. Peter-le-Poor, and the mastership of Emmanuel, were both taken from him. He attended the king at Hampton Court in 1647; but in January following he was again imprisoned. On being released he assisted, on the king's part, at the treaty in the Isle of Wight. The catastrophe that soon after befel his royal master is thought to have hastened his death, which took place August 29, 1649. His works are, A Sermon preached in St. Mary's, Cambridge, on his majesty's inauguration, 1642, 4to, the only thing he ever published; The Valley of Vision, or a clear Sight of sundry Sacred Truths, delivered in twenty-one Sermons, London, 1651, 4to; Prælectiones Theologicæ, London, 1661, fol., published by his nephew.—*Barwick's Life. Walker.*

## HOLSTENIUS, LUCAS.

LUCAS HOLSTENIUS, or LUKE HOLSTEIN, was born at Hamburgh in 1596. He was brought up a protestant, but turned Roman Catholic, and obtained several valuable preferments at Rome, where he died in 1661. He published "A Dissertation on the Life and Writings of Porphyry;" several other erudite disquisitions on classical subjects; and notes upon ancient authors.—*Moreri.*

## HONORATUS, SAINT.

SAINT HONORATUS, the founder of the Monastery of Lerins, who was descended of a noble family, which had



enjoyed the honour of the Consulate, was converted and baptized in the flower of his youth, in spite of the opposition of his father and his whole family. Then he began a life of mortification and severity; he cut his hair short; wore coarse stuffs, and marred his countenance by fasting. One of his brothers named Venantius embraced the same course of life; and the two young men, having distributed their goods among the poor, put themselves under the direction of a holy hermit, named Caprasius, who lived in the island of Marseilles. In his company they made a voyage, and continued some time in Achaia. Venantius died at Methone, and Honoratus returned to Provence. The veneration he entertained for Leontius, bishop of Frejus, induced him to settle in his diocese; and he chose the little island of Lerins, which was then a desert, and infested with serpents, where he built a monastery, which was soon peopled by a great number of monks of all nations. Although Honoratus had long avoided the ministerial function, he was ordained priest, and had a peculiar skill in directing the souls of men. The Church of Arles desired him for their pastor, and he was accordingly consecrated bishop of that city, after Patroclus, but he governed it no longer than two years. He united the divided spirits of his flock, and acquired great esteem for his charity, which led him to distribute in a short time the treasures which his predecessor had amassed. He instructed the people even from his bed, during his last illness, and had preached to them on the day of the Epiphany, about eight days before his death, which happened in 428.—*Fleury*.

## HONORIUS.

HONORIUS, (De Sancta Maria,) whose proper name was Blaise Vauzelle, was born at Limoges in 1651. He made profession among the Carmelites at Toulouse, in

1671; and taught theology with reputation in his order, in which he was prior, counsellor, provincial, and visitor general of the three provinces of France. He died in 1729. The most important and useful of his publications is entitled, *Réflexions sur les Règles et sur l'Usage de la Critique, touchant l'Histoire de l'Eglise, les Ouvrages des Pères, les Actes des anciens Martyrs, les Vies des Saints, &c.* 3 vols, 4to, 1712—1720. He also wrote a multitude of treatises relative to Jansenism and the bull *Unigenitus*.—*Moreri. Cave.*

## HOOKER, RICHARD.

RICHARD HOOKER, commonly called the judicious Hooker, was born of parents in humble circumstances, at Heavitree, near Exeter, about 1554. His great abilities were early observed by the schoolmaster under whom he studied at Exeter; and, by the kindness of his uncle, he was introduced to Bishop Jewel, who, with uncommon liberality, sent him as clerk to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and settled a pension upon him. The death of his patron, in 1571, for a while obscured his prospects; but he found a friend in Dr. Cole, the president of his college, and in Dr. Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of York, who placed his son under Hooker's care. In 1573 he was chosen scholar, and in 1577 he was elected fellow, of his college; and about two years after he was appointed deputy-professor of Hebrew. In 1581 he entered into orders; and soon after, was appointed to preach at St. Paul's Cross.

Isaac Walton remarks, "that on his first public appearance to the world, he was not so happy as to be free from exceptions against a point of doctrine delivered in his sermon, which was, that in God there were two wills, an antecedent, and a consequent will; His first will, that all mankind should be saved, but His second will was,

that those only should be saved, that did live answerable to that degree of grace which He had offered, or afforded them. This seemed to cross a late opinion of Mr. Calvin's, and then taken for granted by many that had not a capacity to examine it, as it had been by him before, and hath been since by Master Henry Mason, Dr. Jackson, Dr. Hammond, and others of great learning, who believed that a contrary opinion intrenches upon the honour and justice of our merciful God. How he justified this, I will not undertake to declare, but it was not excepted against (as Mr. Hooker declares in his rational Answer to Mr. Travers) by John Elmer, then Bishop of London; and this time one of his auditors; and at last one of his advocates too, when Mr. Hooker was accused for it.

“ But the justifying of this doctrine did not prove of so bad consequences, as the kindness of Mrs. Churchman's curing him of his late distemper and cold; for that was so gratefully apprehended by Mr. Hooker, that he thought himself bound in conscience to believe all that she said; so that the good man came to be persuaded by her, ‘ that he was a man of a tender constitution, and that it was best for him to have a wife, that might prove a nurse to him; such an one as might both prolong his life, and make it more comfortable; and such an one she could and would provide for him, if he thought fit to marry.’ And he not considering, that ‘ the children of this world are wiser in their generation, than the children of light;’ but, like a true Nathanael, fearing no guile, because he meant none, did give her such a power as Eleazar was trusted with, (you may read it in the book of Genesis) when he was sent to choose a wife for Isaac; for, even so he trusted her to choose for him, promising upon a fair summons to return to London, and accept of her choice; and, he did so in that or about the year following. Now the wife provided for him, was her daughter Joan, who brought him neither beauty nor



portion; and for her conditions, they were too like that wife's which is by Solomon compared to a 'dripping house;' so that the good man had no reason to 'rejoice in the wife of his youth;' but too just cause to say with the holy prophet, 'woe is me that I am constrained to have my habitation in the tents of Kedar.'

"This choice of Mr. Hooker's (if it were his choice) may be wondered at; but, let us consider that the prophet Ezekiel says, there is a wheel within a wheel, a secret sacred wheel of providence (most visible in marriages) guided by His hand, that allows not the race to the swift, nor bread to the wise, nor good wives to good men: and He that can bring good out of evil, (for mortals are blind to this reason) only knows why this blessing was denied to patient Job, to meek Moses, and to our as meek and patient Mr. Hooker. But so it was; and, let the reader cease to wonder, for, affliction is a divine diet, which though it be not pleasing to mankind, yet Almighty God hath often, very often imposed it as good, though bitter physic, to those children whose souls are dearest to Him.

"And by this marriage the good man was drawn from the tranquillity of his college, from that garden of piety, of pleasure, of peace, and a sweet conversation, into the thorny wilderness of a busy world; into those corroding cares that attend a married priest, and a country parsonage: which was Drayton Beauchamp, in Buckinghamshire, not far from Aylesbury, and in the diocese of Lincoln: to which he was presented by John Cheny, Esquire, then patron of it, the 9th of December, 1584; where he behaved himself so as to give no occasion of evil, but (as St. Paul adviseth a minister of God) 'in much patience, in afflictions, in anguishes, in necessities; in poverty, and no doubt in long-suffering:' yet troubling no man with his discontents and wants.

"And in this condition he continued about a year, in which time his two pupils, Edwin Sandys and George

Cranmer, took a journey to see their tutor, where they found him with a book in his hand (it was the Odes of Horace) he being then like humble and innocent Abel, tending his small allotment of sheep in a common field, which he told his pupils he was forced to do then, for that his servant was gone home to dine, and assist his wife to do some necessary household business. But when his servant returned and released him, then his two pupils attended him unto his house, where their best entertainment was his quiet company, which was presently denied them; for Richard was called to rock the cradle: and the rest of their welcome was so like this, that they staid, but till the next morning, which was time enough to discover and pity their tutor's condition; and they having in that time rejoiced in the remembrance, and then paraphrased on many of the innocent recreations of their younger days, and other like diversions, and thereby given him as much present comfort as they were able, they were forced to leave him to the company of his wife Joan, and seek themselves a quieter lodging for next night. But at their parting from him, Mr. Cranmer said, 'Good tutor, I am sorry your lot is fallen in no better ground as to your parsonage; and, more sorry that your wife proves not a more comfortable companion after you have wearied yourself in your restless studies.' To whom the good man replied, 'My dear George, if saints have usually a double share in the miseries of this life, I that am none, ought not to repine at what my wise Creator hath appointed for me, but labour, (as indeed I do daily) to submit mine to His will, and possess my soul in patience, and peace.'

"At their return to London, Edwin Sandys acquainted his father, who was then Archbishop of York, with his tutor's sad condition, and solicits for his removal to some benefice that might give him a more quiet and a more comfortable subsistence; which his father did most willingly grant him, when it should next fall into his power.

And not long after this time, which was in the year 1585, Mr. Alvie (master of the temple) died, who was a man of a strict life, of great learning, and of so venerable behaviour, as to gain so high a degree of love and reverence from all men; that he was generally known by the name of *Father Alvie*. And at the temple-reading, next after the death of this father Alvie, he, the said Archbishop of York, being then at dinner with the judges, the reader, and benchers of that society, met with a general condolment for the death of father Alvie, and with a high commendation of his saint-like life, and of his great merit both toward God and man: and as they bewailed his death, so they wished for a like pattern of virtue and learning to succeed him. And here came in a fair occasion for the bishop to commend Mr. Hooker to father Alvie's place, which he did with so effectual earnestness, and that seconded with so many other testimonies of his worth, that Mr. Hooker was sent for from Drayton Beauchamp to London, and there the mastership of the temple proposed unto him by the bishop, as a greater freedom from his country cares, the advantage of a better society, and a more liberal pension than his country parsonage did afford him. But these reasons were not powerful enough to incline him to a willing acceptance of it: his wish was rather to gain a better country living, where he might see God's blessings spring out of the earth, and be free from noise (so he exprest the desire of his heart) and eat that bread which he might more properly call his own in privacy and quietness. But, notwithstanding this averseness, he was at last persuaded to accept of the bishop's proposal, and was by patent for life, made master of the temple, the 17th of March, 1585, he being then in the thirty-fourth year of his age."

The meek and humble Hooker found nothing but trouble in his new position. The Puritans were perhaps at this time more violent and godless than at any other;



and Travers, the afternoon lecturer at the temple, being disappointed at not obtaining the master's place, became a vehement assailant. A contemporary writer, Dr. William James, describes the state of things in those days so as to enable us to account for the popularity of Travers. "It is pitiful" he says, "to see how in many places of this land, he is thought the only zealous, learned and godly preacher, that can find most faults, pretend most wants, never giving God once thanks for the abundance of His blessings upon this Church and nation, which for these thirty-two years hath been, yea even at this day is a nurse, nay rather a mother to all the Churches almost in all Christendom. And whereas we ought to teach repentance, amendment of life, faith to God, obedience to superiors, and charity one to another; to rebuke pride, covetousness, wantonness, newfangledness, slanderings, backbitings, and the like: if none of these be once named, but our spiritual pastors torn and traduced, our own vices not once touched, but the Church and churchmen paid home, then is he in many men's judgments, a zealous man, a child of God, never man spake on this wise."

The following document will shew the pitiful nature of the charges brought against Hooker, by Travers.

"Doctrines delivered by Mr. Hooker, as they were set down and shewed by Mr. Travers, March 30, 1585, under this title:—

*"A short note of sundry unsound points of doctrine at divers times delivered by Mr. Hooker in his public sermons.*

"1. The Church of Rome is a true Church of Christ, and a Church sanctified by profession of that truth, which God hath revealed unto us by His Son, though not a pure and perfect Church.

"2. The fathers which lived and died in popish superstition were saved, because they sinned ignorantly.

"3. They which are of the Church of Rome may be

saved by such a faith as they have in Christ, and a general repentance of all their sins.

“4. The Church of Rome holdeth all men sinners, even the blessed Virgin, though some of them think otherwise of her.

“5. The Church of Rome teacheth Christ’s righteousness to be the only meritorious cause of taking away sin.

“6. The Galatians which joined with faith in Christ, circumcision as necessary unto salvation, notwithstanding be saved.

“7. Neither the Church of Rome, nor the Galatians deny the foundation directly, but only by consequent: and therefore may be saved. Or else neither the Lutherans, nor whosoever hold any error (for every error by consequent, denieth the foundation) may be saved.

“8. An additament taketh not away that whereunto it is added, but confirmeth it. As he that saith of any, he is a *righteous man*, saith that he is a man: except it be privative; as when he saith, he is a *dead man*: then he denieth him to be a man: and of this sort of (privative) additaments neither are works which are added to Christ by the Church of Rome; nor circumcision added to Him by the Galatians.

“9. The Galatians’ case is harder than the case of the Church of Rome; for they added to Christ circumcision, which God hath forbidden and abolished: but that which the Church of Rome addeth are works which God hath commanded.

“10. No one sequel urged by the Apostle against the Galatians, for joining circumcision with Christ, but may be as well enforced against the Lutherans holding ubiquity.

“11. A bishop or a cardinal of the Church of Rome, yea, the pope himself, denying all other errors of popery, notwithstanding his opinion of justification by works, may be saved.

“12. Predestination is not of the absolute will of God, but conditional.

“ 13. The doings of the wicked are not of the will of God positive, but only permissive.

“ 14. The reprobates are not rejected, but for the evil works which God did foresee they would commit.

“ 15. The assurance of things which we believe by the word, is not so sure, as of those which we perceive by sense.”

We may here add the remarks made by Archbishop Whitgift upon these articles.

“ I. Papists living and dying papists may notwithstanding be saved. The reason; ignorance excused them. As the Apostle allegeth, 1 Tim. i. 13, ‘ I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly.’ ”

*The Archbishop's judgment.* “ Not papists, but our fathers. Nor they all, but many of them. Nor living and dying papists, but living in popish superstitions. Nor simply might, but might by the mercy of God, be saved. Ignorance did not excuse the fault to make it no fault: but the less their fault was, in respect of ignorance, the more hope we have, that God was merciful to them.”

“ II. Papists hold the foundation of faith, so that they may be saved, notwithstanding their opinion of merit.”

*Archbishop.* “ And papists overthrow the foundation of faith, both by their doctrine of merit, and otherwise, many ways. So that if they have, as their errors deserve, I do not see how they should be saved.”

“ III. General repentance may serve to their salvation, though they confess not their error of merit.

*Archbishop.* “ General repentance will not serve any but the faithful man. Nor him for any sin, but for such sins only as he doth not mark, nor know to be sin.”

“ IV. The Church of Rome is within the new covenant.”

*Archbishop.* “ The Church of Rome is not as the assemblies of Turks, Jews and Painims.”

“ V. The Galatians, joining the law with Christ,



might have been saved, before they received the Epistle."

*Archbishop.* "Of the Galatians, before they were told of their error, what letteth us to think, as of our fathers, before the Church of Rome was admonished of her defection from the truth?"

The opposition of Travers became so visible, and the consequences so dangerous, that Archbishop Whitgift caused Travers to be silenced by the high commission court; whereupon the latter presented his supplication to the privy council, and, upon its failure, published it. This obliged Hooker to publish an answer, which he inscribed to the archbishop. This answer was the germ of his famous work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Finding the temple an unfit place for those studies which his undertaking rendered necessary, he entreated the archbishop to remove him to some quieter situation; and, accordingly, in 1591, he was presented by that prelate to the rectory of Boscomb, in Wiltshire, and, in the same year, to the prebend of Nether-Haven, in the cathedral of Salisbury, of which he was also made sub-dean. At Boscomb he finished four books of his work, which were printed in 1594. In 1595 he was presented by Queen Elizabeth to the rectory of Bishopsbourne, in Kent, where he spent the remainder of his life. Here he composed the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which was dedicated to the archbishop, and published by itself in 1597; and here also he finished the sixth, seventh, and eighth books of that work.

Hooker is one of the great divines, who, adhering strictly to the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith only, is strictly catholic as to the sacraments, and what he calls the "sacramentals." Of baptism he says, "Unless as the Spirit is a necessary inward cause, so water were a necessary outward mean, to our regeneration, what construction should we give unto those words wherein we are said to be new born, and that ἐξ ὕδατος,

even of water? Why are we taught, that with water God doth purify and cleanse His Church? Wherefore do the Apostles of Christ term baptism a bath of regeneration? What purpose had they in giving men advice to receive outward baptism, and in persuading them it did avail to remission of sins? If outward baptism were a cause in itself possessed of that power, either natural or supernatural, without the present operation whereof no such effect could possibly grow, it must then follow, that seeing effects do never prevent the necessary causes out of which they spring, no man could ever receive grace before baptism: which being apparently both known, and also confessed to be otherwise, in many particulars, although in the rest we make not baptism a cause of grace; yet the grace which is given them with their baptism, doth so far forth depend on the very outward sacrament, that God will have it embraced, not only as a sign or token of what we receive, but also as an instrument or means whereby we receive grace, because baptism is a sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ; and so through His most precious merit obtain, as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life. There are that elevate too much the ordinary and immediate means of life, relying wholly upon the bare conceit of that eternal election, which, notwithstanding, includeth a subordination of means, without which we are not actually brought to enjoy what God secretly did intend; and therefore, to build upon God's election, if we keep not ourselves to the ways which He hath appointed for men to walk in, is but a self-deceiving vanity. When the Apostle saw men called to the participation of Jesus Christ, after the Gospel of God embraced, and the sacra-

ment of life received, he feareth not then to put them in the number of elect saints; he then accounteth them delivered from death, and clean purged from all sin. Till then, notwithstanding their preordination unto life, which none could know of, saving God, what were they, in the Apostle's own account, but children of wrath, as well as others, plain aliens, altogether without hope, strangers, utterly without God in this present world? So that by sacraments, and other sensible tokens of grace, we may boldly gather, that He Whose mercy vouchsafeth now to bestow the means, hath also sithence intended us that whereunto they lead. But let us never think it safe to presume of our own last, and by bare conjectural collections of His first intent and purpose, the means failing that should come between. Predestination bringeth not to life without the grace of eternal vocation, wherein our baptism is implied. For as we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we Christian men in the eye of the Church of God but by new birth; nor according to the manifest ordinary course of divine dispensation new born, but by baptism which both declareth and maketh us Christians. In which respect, we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, a seal perhaps to the grace of election before received; but to our sanctification here, a step that hath not any before it."

Of the Eucharist he writes thus:—"The disciples, when Christ appeared to them in a far more strange and miraculous manner, moved no questions, but rejoiced greatly in what they saw. . . . If then the presence of Christ with them did so much move, judge what their thoughts and affections were at the time of this new presentation of Christ, not before their eyes, but within their souls. They had learned before that His flesh and blood are the true cause of eternal life; that this they are not by the bare force of their own



substance, but through the dignity and worth of His person, which offered them up by way of sacrifice for the life of the whole world, and doth make them still effectual thereunto: finally, that to us they are life in particular, by being particularly received. Thus much they knew, although as yet they understood not perfectly to what effect or issue the same would come, till at the length being assembled for no other cause which they would imagine but to have eaten the passover only, that Moses appointed, when they saw their Lord and Master, with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, first bless and consecrate, for the endless good of all generations till the world's end, the chosen elements of bread and wine; which elements, made for ever the instruments of life by virtue of His divine benediction, they being the first that were commanded to receive from Him, the first which were warranted by His promise, that not only unto them at the present time, but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same, those mysteries should serve as conducts of life, and conveyance of His body and blood unto them; was it possible they should hear that voice, *Take, eat, this is My body: drink ye all of this, this is My blood*; possible, that doing what was required, and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves? . . . . These things considered, how should a virtuously disposed mind better resolve with itself than thus? . . . . *they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb, and made joyful in the strength of this new wine: this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold; this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body; in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving.* . . . .

His meekness, his humility, his tenderness to others, and severity to himself, were very remarkable. Like all the saints of God, he had to endure the malignity of enemies whom Satan stirred up against him; and on one occasion his friends thought it necessary to prosecute certain persons who had slandered him; but he, when his slanderers were to suffer, laboured to procure their pardon; and when that was denied him, his reply was, "That however he would fast and pray that God would give them repentance and patience to undergo their punishment." And his prayers were so far returned into his own bosom, that the first was granted, if we may believe a penitent behaviour and an open confession. And it is observable, that after this time he would often say to Dr. Saravia, "Oh with what quietness did I enjoy my soul after I was free from the fears of my slander! and how much more after a conflict and victory over my desires of revenge!"

About the year 1600, and of his age 46, he fell into a long and sharp sickness, occasioned by a cold taken in his passage by water betwixt London and Gravesend; from the malignity of which he was never recovered: for, after that time till his death he was not free from thoughtful days, and restless nights; but a submission to His will that makes the sick man's bed easy by giving rest to his soul, made his very languishment comfortable; and yet all this time he was solicitous in his study, and said often to Dr. Saravia (who saw him daily, and was the chief comfort of his life) "That he did not beg a long life of God, for any other reason, but to live to finish his three remaining books of polity; and then, Lord, let thy servant depart in peace," which was his usual expression. And God heard his prayers, though he denied the Church the benefit of them, as completed by himself; and it is thought that he hastened his own death, by hastening to give life to his books; but this

is certain, that the nearer he was to his death, the more he grew in humility, in holy thoughts and resolutions.

About a month before his death, this good man, that never knew, or at least never considered, the pleasures of the palate, began first to lose his appetite, and then to have an averseness to all food ; insomuch, that he seemed to live some intermitted weeks by the smell of meat only, and yet still studied and writ. And now his guardian angel seemed to foretell him, that the day of his dissolution drew near ; for which his vigorous soul appeared to thirst. In this time of his sickness, and not many days before his death, his house was robbed ; of which he having notice, his question was, “ Are my books and written papers safe ? ” and being answered, “ That they were ; ” his reply was, “ then it matters not ; for no other loss can trouble me.”

About one day before his death, Dr. Saravia, who knew the very secrets of his soul, (for they were supposed to be confessors to each other) came to him, and after a conference of the benefit, the necessity, and safety of the Church's absolution, it was resolved that the Doctor should give him both that and the sacrament the day following. To which end the doctor came, and after a short retirement and privacy, they two returned to the company, and then the doctor gave him, and some of those friends which were with him, the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of our Jesus. Which being performed, the doctor thought he saw a reverend gaiety and joy in his face ; but it lasted not long ; for his bodily infirmities did return suddenly, and became more visible, insomuch that the doctor apprehended death ready to seize him ; yet, after some amendment, left him at night, with a promise to return early the day following ; which he did, and then found him better in appearance, deep in contemplation, and not inclinable to discourse ; which



gave the Doctor occasion to require his present thoughts : to which he replied, "That he was meditating the number and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order, without which, peace could not be in heaven ; and oh that it might be so on earth !" after which words he said, " I have lived to see this world is made up of perturbations, and I have been long preparing to leave it, and gathering comfort for the dreadful hour of making my account with God, which I now apprehend to be near ; and, though I have by His grace loved Him in my youth, and feared him in mine age, and laboured to have a conscience void of offence to Him and to all men ; yet, if Thou, O Lord, be extreme to mark what I have done amiss, who can abide it ? and therefore, where I have failed, Lord show mercy unto me, for I plead not my righteousness, but the forgiveness of my unrighteousness, for His merits Who died to purchase pardon for penitent sinners ; and since I owe Thee a death, Lord let it not be terrible, and then take Thine own time, I submit to it ; yet not mine, O Lord, but let Thy will be done ;" with which expression he fell into a dangerous slumber : dangerous, as to his recovery ; yet recover he did, but it was to speak only these few words, " Good doctor, God hath heard my daily petitions, for I am at peace with all men, and He is at peace with me ; and from that blessed assurance I feel that inward joy, which this world can neither give nor take from me : my conscience beareth me this witness, and this witness makes the thoughts of death joyful. I could wish to live to do the Church more service, but cannot hope it, for my days are past as a shadow that returns not." More he would have spoken, but his spirits failed him ; and, after a short conflict betwixt nature and death, a quiet sigh put a period to his last breath, and so he fell asleep.

Dr. Wordsworth remarks that " Hooker may justly be regarded as the genuine lineal descendant of the most

enlightened English reformers ; and possessing learning equal to that of any of them, with more opportunities for meditation, and the accumulated advantage of their labours and experience, he may, perhaps not improperly, be considered as exhibiting in his writings a model of the true, settled, most improved, mature, and catholic principles of the English Reformation. But these virtues did not screen him from having many adversaries. At the time when Hooker wrote, Calvinism *doctrinal* as well as *disciplinarian*, had made considerable progress in England ; and Hooker's, unhappily for his own peace of mind, were almost the only works of great extent which were calculated to arrest the progress of the doctrinal Calvinists. In the year 1599, a tract was published in 4to. entitled, A Christian Letter of certain English Protestants, unfeigned favourers of the present state of Religion, authorized and professed in England, unto that reverend and learned man, Mr. R. Hooker, requiring resolution in certain matters of doctrine, (which seem to overthrow the foundation of Christian religion, and of the Church among us) expressly contained in his five books of Ecclesiastical Policy." This book is one of the earliest productions of those mal-contents, who were afterwards called *doctrinal Puritans*. It is the doctrines of Hooker with which they quarrel : and they profess (in contradistinction to the abettors of the Geneva discipline) an unfeigned attachment to the external establishments of the Church of England. The work is further deserving of notice, as exhibiting, I believe, the earliest example, both in the matter and manner of the argument, of those numerous publications in which some Calvinistic writers have thoughtlessly and intemperately indulged themselves, from the days of this Christian letter, and from Prynne and Hickman downwards, to Edwards, and Toplady, and Bowman, and Sir Richard Hill, and Overton. Can it be believed, the authors of the letter in question tax the

meek, the wise, the virtuous, the saint-like Richard Hooker with betraying and renouncing the doctrines to which he had solemnly subscribed? They *charge him with designs of bringing back Popery*. They accuse him of a wanton attack on the memory of Calvin. They condemn him of unsoundness of doctrine respecting grace, and free-will, and justification, and predestination, and the *conditions* of the Christian covenant, and the sacraments of the Christian Church. It is curious to see the Thirty-nine Articles, the Liturgy, the Homilies, Bishop Jewel's Apology, Dean Nowell's Catechism, and the writings of many others of Hooker's protestant predecessors, solemnly cited against him, and confronted in due form with extracts from the Ecclesiastical Polity, for the purpose of convicting him of deserting and denying the principles of that Church of which he was a minister, in whose cause he toiled day and night, and in the defence of which, I believe, it may truly be said, that it was God's good pleasure that he should die. The following extracts may serve as specimens of this performance:—

“The reverend Fathers of our Church call Mr. Calvin one of the best writers, &c. (J. Whitgift, p. 300. Bishop Jewel, Defence of Apolog. 2 part, p. 149. Read any English writer defending the Church of England; and namely Fulke against Stapleton's Fortress, p. 71. Read Apolog. Anglican.) How greatly all Christian Churches are to praise for that man's faithful labours, and how instantly therefore all sorts of Papists have and do endeavour and strive to diminish his credit, all the Christian world most abundantly both by word and by writing do testify. *Wherefore we wonder not a little, what moved you to make choice of that worthy pillar of the Church above all other, to traduce him, and to make him a spectacle before all Christians.*”—p. 37.

By the way, some may think it strange, and yet it is



very true, that this same character of Calvin, which is here referred to, and thus accounted of, has in the present day been more than once appealed to, as a proof of the high esteem in which Calvin was regarded by Richard Hooker; and, what shall we say? Why, perhaps, as *a proof that* the articles of the Church of England are Calvinistical. *Ex quovis ligno fit, &c.* Again. "In all your books—reason is highly set up against holy scripture, and reading against preaching: the Church of Rome favourably admitted to be of the house of God: Calvin with the reformed churches full of faults, and most of all they which endeavoured to be most reformed from conformity with the Church of Rome: almost all the principal points of our English Creed greatly shaken and contradicted. If you do not sincerely, plainly, and truly answer all these our necessary doubts and demands, what shall we have cause to think of these your tedious and laborious writings? Shall we do you wrong to suspect you as a privy and subtle enemy to the whole state of the English Church, and that would have men to deem her majesty to have done ill in abolishing the Romish religion, and banishing the pope's authority?—Will you bring us to Atheism or to Popery?"—p. 43. "We beseech you therefore in the name of Jesus Christ, and as you will answer for the use of those great gifts which God hath bestowed upon you, that you would return and peruse advisedly all your five books, compare them with the articles of our profession set out by public authority, and with the works apologetical, and other authorized sermons and homilies of our Church, and of the reverend fathers of our land, and with the holy book of God, and all other the queen's majesty's proceedings."—p. 44. "All the articles of our religion, and many parts of our Church government checked, blamed, and contradicted."—p. 45. "Thirdly, that you would be careful not to corrupt the English creed and

pure doctrine, *whereunto you have subscribed*, either by philosophy, &c.—p. 47. “The Church of England believeth, that *predestination unto life is the eternal purpose*, &c. But you, Master Hooker, seem to us to affirm contrary, when you say, *If any man doubt*, &c.”—p. 15. “You make it (the sacrament) a means *conditional*, and no less required than faith itself.—And herein we are suitors unto you to tell us, whether the *condition* of sacraments make not for the additament of *works* unto *faith*, in that which the English Church holdeth to be only and properly of *faith*.”—p. 28.

After some delay, Hooker was prevailed upon to undertake a reply to this letter, but death prevented the execution of his purpose. Dr. Covell, his friend, then undertook the work; and he speaking of his own performance, and what Hooker’s would have been if executed, expresses himself thus: “His answer would have been far more general and more speedy, if he could either have resolved to have done it, or after he had resolved, could have lived to have seen it finished. But first of all he was loath to intermeddle with so weak adversaries; thinking it *unfit* (as himself said) *that a man that hath a long journey should turn back to beat every barking cur*; and having taken it in hand, his urgent and greater affairs, together with the want of strength, weakened with much labour, would not give him time to see it finished.”—Preface to a *Just and temperate Defence of the Five Books of Ecclesiastical Policy*, p. 12.

His works were published by Dr. Gauden in 1662, in fol., with a life. A second edition, with Hooker’s Life, by Walton, appeared in 1666, fol., reprinted in 1676, 1682, 1723, and 1820, at the Clarendon press; Hanbury, London, 1830; and Keble, Oxford, 1836, 3 vols, 8vo.—*Walton. Wordsworth. Keble.*

## HOOPER, GEORGE.

GEORGE HOOPER was born at Grimley, in Worcester-

shire, in 1640, and educated first at St. Paul's, and afterwards at Westminster School, whence he was sent to Christ Church, Oxford, where he distinguished himself by his knowledge of philosophy, mathematics, Greek and Roman antiquities, and the Oriental languages, in which last he was assisted by Dr. Pocock. In 1672, he became chaplain to Morley, Bishop of Winchester, who collated him to the rectory of Havant, in Hampshire, which he resigned for the rectory of East Woodhay, in the same county. In 1673, he became chaplain to Archbishop Sheldon, who, in 1675, gave him the rectory of Lambeth, and afterwards the precentorship of Exeter. In 1677, he commenced D.D., and the same year, being made almoner to the princess of Orange, he went over to Holland, where, at the request of her royal highness, he regulated her chapel according to the usage of the Church of England. In 1680, he declined the divinity-professorship at Oxford; and the same time he was made chaplain to Charles II. In 1685, by the king's command, he attended the Duke of Monmouth in the Tower. He remained firm and loyal to the Church under the tyranny of the profligate James II. He felt that when the question arose whether the Church should be preserved or the king deposed, he ought to take part against the king. He did not, therefore, hesitate to take the oaths to William and Mary, and nearly persuaded Bishop Ken to do the same. (*See Life of Ken.*) In 1691, Queen Mary, unsolicited, appointed him to the deanery of Canterbury, whereupon he resigned the rectory of Woodhay; and he was made chaplain to their majesties the same year. In 1698, when a preceptor was chosen for the Duke of Gloucester, though both the royal parents pressed earnestly to have Hooper, yet William III. appointed Bishop Burnet, being unwilling perhaps to appoint a man conscientiously attached to the Church of England. In 1701, Hooper was chosen prolocutor to the lower house of convocation; and he was likewise offered the primacy of



Ireland, by the Earl of Rochester, then lord lieutenant, which he declined. In May, 1703, he was nominated to the Bishopric of St. Asaph; and March following he was translated to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells. The Bishopric of Bath and Wells he refused to take until he had consulted his friend Bishop Ken, who resigned the bishopric and rejoiced in the appointment. (*See Life of Ken.*) In 1710, when the articles of Sacheverell's impeachment were debated, he endeavoured to excuse that divine, and entered his protest against the vote. This devotion to his duty, his orthodoxy, his piety, and his affectionate disposition, attached to him the clergy of his see, and he was so attached to his diocese, that he could not be prevailed on to accept the see of London, on the death of Dr. Compton; or that of York on the death of Dr. Sharp. He died at Barkley, in Somersetshire, in 1727, and was interred in the cathedral of Wells. He wrote, *The Church of England free from the imputation of Popery; A fair and methodical Discussion of the first great Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, concerning the Infallible Guide; A Discourse concerning Lent; A Calculation of the Credibility of Human Testimony; New Danger of Presbytery; De Valentinianorum Hæresi Conjecturæ, quibus illius Origo ex Ægyptiaca Theologia deducitur; An Inquiry into the State of the ancient Measures, the Attic, the Roman, and especially the Jewish; with an Appendix concerning our old English Money and Measures of Content; De Patriarchæ Jacobi Benedictione Gen. 49, Conjecturæ; A Tract on Divorce; and Sermons.* A beautiful edition of his works was printed at Oxford, 1757, folio, by Dr. Hunt, Hebrew professor. *Todd's Deans of Canterbury. Burnet. Bowles's Life of Ken.*

HOOPER, OR HOPER, JOHN.

JOHN HOOPER, or HOPER, was born in Somersetshire,

in 1495, and entered at Merton College, Oxford, in 1514, his uncle being a fellow of that house. He took his B.A. degree in 1518, and he became, according to Strype, a monk at Gloucester, a Cistercian. But after some time he returned to Oxford, where he found a small, but influential body of men, who, being instructed in the "new learning" of the reforming party on the Continent, were desirous of seeing the Church of England reformed. As no personal intercourse between those who wished to reform the Church of England, and the continental reformers, had taken place, it does not appear that the friends of a reformation had been hurried into any great excesses. Although they gave free expression to their desire to see the abuses of the Church corrected, and animadverted upon certain doctrines prevalent in, but not authoritatively affirmed by the Church of England, they excited the indignation of heads of houses. Young Hooper, a bold, uncompromising man, particularly excited the anger of these "rabbines in Oxford," as Fox rather disrespectfully calls the heads of houses, and chiefly "by the procurement of Dr. Smith, he was compelled to void the university."

He was for a time chaplain and steward to Sir Thomas Arundel, who, though partial to him personally, became alarmed, like a good conservative, at his reforming principles, and sent him on a visit to the Bishop of Winchester. The Bishop of Winchester, with great kindness, and condescension, conferred with him for four or five days; but as he probably had little more to say, than that the reforming principles would lead to the subversion of the established Church, he did not succeed in convincing the young man. He sent him back to Sir Thomas, "right well commending his learning and wit," but as Fox adds, "having in his breast a grudging stomach against Master Hooper still." How Fox could know what kind of stomach the Bishop of Winchester bore in his breast, it is not easy to say. If it was a surmise, it was not a charitable one.

On the passing of the act of six articles, or the bloody statute, Hooper went abroad, when he became the friend of Bullinger. Forgetful of the vow, which as a monk was upon him, he married a foreign woman.

On the accession of Edward VI., when Hooper was about to return to England, he received an affectionate address from Bullinger; and it is curious to find him describing Zurich, which we regard as one of the loveliest spots of creation, as "a barren, a sombre, and unpleasant country, rude and savage;" and England, as "a land flowing with milk and honey, replenished with all pleasure and felicity."

When Hooper returned to England, he became chaplain to the Duke of Somerset, and a popular preacher in London. In a great movement, we are not surprised if some persons are hurried into extreme opinions, and this was probably the case with Hooper. His old Oxford opponent, Dr. Smith, asserted that he thundered from the pulpit against all the doctrines of the ancient and apostolic Church, and spoke of the sacraments with contempt, "esteeming the holy eucharist as no more than a wheaten loaf," adding that he inculcated certain immoral doctrines, not necessary to be mentioned here. Calumny and misrepresentation are not sins confined to ultra-protestantism. He engaged in a controversy with Bishop Gardiner, and was one of the witnesses in the prosecution of Bishop Bonner.

At length, in 1550, he was nominated by the king to the Bishopric of Gloucester, on the death of Wakeman, Abbot of Tewkesbury, the first bishop of that see. And now the prejudices which Hooper had imbibed when abroad began to display themselves; he entertained conscientious scruples against the use of the old catholic vestments, which our Church still retained. There was much to be said in favour of these scruples, on the part of Hooper. Instead of reforming the old Church, he had learned when abroad to desire the substitution of a



new sect, and he desired therefore to discontinue any thing which should induce men to look upon our's as the old Catholic Church. It was not for his brother reformers to judge of him with severity; they had been making changes in the Church every year, and why should not he contend for further change? He knew too, his own value; that it was desirable to secure the services of a man, energetic, able, and popular, as he was; he deemed it his duty, therefore, to endeavour to make his bargain. But without his compliance to the ecclesiastical rule, Dr. Cranmer, the archbishop, refused to consecrate him.

The Earl of Warwick wrote to the archbishop, requesting him to waive the insisting upon these ceremonies, and that this was the king's desire no less than his own. It was likewise moved, that the archbishop would not charge the elect of Gloucester with any oath against his conscience. For it seems, Hooper had scrupled an oath, which by the law he was obliged to take.

The archbishop, it is likely, having neither liberty nor inclination to gratify such singularities, refused to comply. Upon this the Earl of Warwick prevailed with the king to write for a dispensation with Hooper, discharging Cranmer from all penalties and forfeitures to which he might otherwise be liable. The archbishop, unwilling to run the risk of *præmunire*, by obeying the king's private will, against his public one in the laws, craved leave to be excused. And since there was no coming at the episcopal character, without going through the customary forms, endeavours were used to satisfy Hooper's conscience. To this purpose, Ridley, Bishop of London, had a conference with him, and argued the point at length, but without success. The council being apprehensive these disputes might start more questions, and grow to farther inconvenience, sent for Hooper, and advised him to acquiesce. He intreated the board he might have the liberty of putting the reasons of his

opinion in writing, which was granted. This paper was given Ridley to answer it.

Hooper to inform himself further, wrote to Bucer, and Peter Martyr, for their judgment upon the controversy. He received an answer from both; Peter Martyr's letter was to this effect:—"He expresses his satisfaction at Hooper's endeavour to retrieve the ancient purity, and unaffected plainness in religion; that he found it no small difficulty to disengage himself from the customs at Strasburgh, where the distinctions of habit, with respect to holy ministrations, was laid aside: that in religious rites he was for keeping as close as possible to the precedents of holy Scripture, and the most uncorrupted ages of the Church. However, he could not go so far in the other extreme, as to believe the substance of religion affected by clothes: he thought things of this nature altogether indifferent, and left at liberty by the word of God. Had he been of Hooper's mind, that the customary habits for priests and bishops had been clearly unlawful, he would never have joined himself to the English communion. He thought conformity in these matters at present might be a serviceable expedient. That the contesting circumstantials ought to be declined till the Reformation was better settled: that exerting our zeal upon indefensible points, and things of small moment, might lose the good opinion of the people, make them question the judgment of the reformed preachers, and give no credit to what they delivered in matters of the least importance. He proceeds to commend Hooper for his great pains in preaching: that by his talent and application this way, he had gained a considerable reputation, and put himself in a condition of doing a great deal of service. And here he precautions him not to overshoot in his zeal, and launch out his invectives, for that this would be the way to disappoint his pious intention. Besides, by charging these indifferent things as altogether unlawful, we shall, says he, draw an impu-

tation upon unexceptionable communions, and condemn the practice of the most celebrated antiquity."

And whereas Hooper had objected, that the sacerdotal habits were marks of Judaism, and would in effect return us to the Aaronical priesthood; to this, Peter Martyr replies, that abstaining from blood, and things strangled, were part of the Judaic institution; however, the council of Jerusalem commanded the Gentiles upon the same observance: this was done out of a reconciling principle, and to avoid giving offence. That tithes for the maintenance of the clergy, were likewise a branch of the Mosaic law. That it would be difficult to produce a command in the new Testament for singing psalms in public assemblies. That the Christian Church from the very beginning had gone upon the imitation of the Jewish economy in several particulars. That the festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide, are not without something of ground from the solemnities of the old law. Are these holidays therefore to be set aside, because of their resemblance with the Jewish practice?

To proceed; Hooper objected further, that these distinctions of habit were inventions of antichrist, and that we ought not only to renounce the pope's jurisdiction, but stand off from all the novelties and customs of that see.

To this, Martyr answers: That to maintain the unlawfulness of all rites and customs practised in the Church of Rome, looks like an indefensible assertion: that to govern by such narrow maxims would draw a very inconvenient restraint upon the Church of God. Our ancestors moved much more freely than this comes to. They made no difficulty of turning heathen temples into Christian churches: they translated the revenues dedicated to the support of idolatry, to pious uses, and the maintenance of the clergy. Besides, he thought Hooper mistaken in his supposition: he could not grant, that these vestments for officiating, were brought into



the Church by the pope, For, says he, 'Don't we read in the Ecclesiastical History, that St. John, the apostle, wore a gold plate, or mitre? And does not Pontius, in the Life of St. Cyprian, acquaint us, that this saint, at his martyrdom, gave part of his episcopal robes to his deacons, and was executed in a linen habit?' Thus, St. Chrysostom makes mention of the white vestments, in which the clergy performed their ministration: and here he puts Hooper in mind, that persons at their baptism put on a white habit.

On the other side, granting these distinctions were the inventions of the see of Rome, he did not think the contagion of popery so malignant as to carry infection to every thing it touched, and make it prove mortal to a good man that made use of it. Hooper himself owned, that every thing in religion was not to be condemned upon the score of it being a human constitution. For instance, to communicate in the forenoon fasting, stands upon no higher ground than ecclesiastical, that is, human authority, and yet he conceived Hooper would not censure this custom. His opinion was, therefore, that the ancient usage ought to be continued for a time—that the pressing unseasonable alterations might obstruct advantages of a more significant kind. That to prevent any weak brother's being misled by the continuance of the customary habits, the people ought to be reminded of the indifference of these things,—that they don't reach into the substance of religion, nor make part of the essentials in divine worship.

Hooper had objected in the third place, that the particularity and richness of this religious equipage, would be apt to draw the eyes of the congregation, to break their attention, and turn to an amusement; whereas if the habit was plain and unornamented, nothing of this would happen.

To this, Martyr replied, that things commonly seen, are seldom gazed at to any disorder: and if the people

should be affected to any degree more than ordinary, it is to be hoped the solemnity of the habit, the holy pomp might prove serviceable to them, that it might awaken their respect, and recollect their thoughts for the business they were about; and this seems to be one end of the institution of the sacraments, that by sensible signs, the mind might be wrought up to proper meditations.

Hooper argued, that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin;" to disentangle him from the misinterpretation of this text, Martyr refers him to the epistles of Timothy and Titus, where it is said, that "to the clean, all things are clean," and "that every creature of God is good."

Hooper urged in the last place, that we ought to have an express warrant from Scripture for every thing belonging to religion. Martyr was of a different sentiment, and believed, that provided the substance was secured, and the general rules observed, the governors of the Church had a discretionary latitude in lesser matters.

This is Peter Martyr's resolution upon the question. And Bucer, in his answer to Hooper, is of the same opinion. To give the reader part of his letter, he begins with lamenting the rise of the controversy, and wishes it may be speedily taken up. He discovers his inclination for the removal of the customary habits, and tells him that at Strasburgh, Ulm, Augsburg, and other places in Germany, where he had any interest, he prevailed that the sacraments might not be administered with any such peculiarity. He complains of the abuse of these things in England, and that the marks and support of antichristianism were scandalously common and apparent: to make good this charge, he offers at several instances. And here he begins with the sacrilegious invasions of the laity; that they seized and plundered the best preferments, gave two or three benefices to their stewards and huntsmen, but with reservation of part of the profits to themselves: thus they put such vicars upon the people; not those who were best qualified, but

such as would engage upon the lowest terms, and afford the best bargains. The universities, as he goes on, which were to furnish the Church with proper guides, had no small number of students, either erroneous in their belief, or licentious in their practice. And as to the service of the Church, it was performed in such a cold, lame, and unintelligible manner, that the people were little better edified, than if the office were said in the Phenician or Indian language. Neither baptism nor marriage were celebrated with that gravity and solemnity the business required : that the people can hardly distinguish between the Lord's Supper and the mass, excepting that the liturgy is in English. That pastoral duties are lamentably neglected, that there are no catechetical instructions, no private admonitions, no public censures of disorder : the discipline of the Church is so little enforced, that the spiritual authority is in a manner disregarded, and few persons will so much as own, that Christ gave His ministers the power of *binding* and *loosing*. That people are promiscuously admitted to the privileges of communion, without any proof of being qualified either in faith or manners : " that they appear empty before the Lord," and take little care of the poor at their religious assemblies : that the churches are made places for commerce and diversion : and that the audience are so far from observing that plainness and sobriety in clothes, recommended by the apostles, that the highest solemnities of religion cannot make them baulk their vanity, nor come to the Lord's table without gold and jewels, without expense and gaudiness in dressing. Alas ! as he goes on, the meaning of the Church, the communion of saints, and the kingdom of Christ, are little understood : the want of discipline is the occasion of this unhappy ignorance : thus the fear of God, and the notion of religion, make a very faint impression ; and hence it is, that lying, cheating, theft, perjury, and whoredom, are so much the complaint of the times.



These disorders, he tells Hooper, are the main properties, the strength and sinews of antichrist: these, therefore, are the things which ought to be combated in the first place, and against which our zeal ought to be principally employed.

As to the distinction of clothes, he does not think their being formerly abused, a sufficient reason not to use them, or that there is any iniquity in the shape or colour of what we put on. He would gladly know, what text of Scripture there is to prove, that the devil, or ill men, have such a power over God's creatures, as to make them good for nothing, or unlawful.

It is certain, continues Bucer, that our Saviour has only prescribed the substance in matters of order, and the administration of the sacraments, and that the circumstances are left to the regulations of those who preside.

Thus, for instance, we neither receive the communion in the evening, nor in a private house, nor in a posture of discumbency, nor yet in a congregation of men only. And who could justly condemn the Church, if all those who came to receive the Lord's Supper should appear in a white habit as they formerly did at baptism? To deny a liberty of practice within this compass, will bring us to this conclusion, that the Church has no power to appoint any thing with respect to the Lord's Supper, without express command from our Saviour: now this cannot be affirmed without charging all places of Christendom with scandalous prevarication. For what Churches are there that do not vary from the institution of the Lord's Supper in several circumstances? They are so far from having their time, and place, and posture commanded by our Saviour, that on the other side His example is quite different from the general practice: for our Lord instituted His supper in the evening, in a private house, after the eating of the paschal lamb, in a posture different from that now received, neither

were there any women at the solemnity. Another absurdity is, that the standing clear of the abuse of God's creatures, though received with never so much purity of intention, is impracticable upon these principles. And lastly, at this rate, wicked men may in a great measure destroy the benefit of the creation, and make those things they have misemployed a sort of forbidden fruit to others.

These fancies, therefore, ought to be discharged by good men; neither is there any fear the granting the Church a liberty in these matters, should give our holy ministrations a tincture of superstition or paganism, or revive the ceremonial law.

As to religious rites and externals, the design of them is to recommend the service of God Almighty. Now we know distinction and richness of habit in civil offices, are a service to the character. An extraordinary appearance in these cases operates upon the generality, strikes their mind through their senses, and awakens a regard for the magistracy. Now what should hinder its having the same effect upon religion? As for the texts of Scripture against human tradition, urged by Hooper, Bucer replies, they do not reach the case in hand: the censure of these traditions affects only those who make them part of the vitals of religion, and prefer them to the divine commands.

In this letter, we see Bucer makes a tragical complaint of the licentiousness and disorder of the times. If it is inquired why the bishops did not exert their character, and apply the usual remedy, it may be answered, they lay under the discountenance of the state. The censure of excommunication had been disused, since the beginning of this reign: whether there was any command laid upon the bishops, to forbear the exercise of their jurisdiction, or that there was a project on foot for drawing the cognizance of ecclesiastical causes to the secular courts, or that the publishing the process, under the

king's authority, weakened the terror of the sentence, is not easy to determine. However, it is certain, this solemn part of discipline was, as it were suspended, or of little significancy.

Thus almost every thing grew out of order, and profaneness, and immorality had an unlimited range. This made Bishop Latimer press for the restitution of the ancient discipline, in his sermons before the king. The English, says he, are infamous for whoredom, beyond any other part of the world. Besides, they glory in their shame, and make a diversion of being wicked. To check this outrageous disorder, he intreats the king to restore the discipline of Christ, and return the Church the power of excommunication. That excluding offenders from the benefit of communion, is our Saviour's appointment: now no body is able to make a better provision than Infinite Wisdom: and that the exercise of discipline was the likeliest way to stop the progress of vice, and avert the judgments of heaven."

But if the case was thus, and the regale lay too hard upon the Church, the question is, whether it had not been more advisable for the bishops to have resumed their spiritual authority, acted upon our Saviour's commission, and ventured the displeasure of the state.

As for Bucer, and Martyr's letters, they had not that effect upon Hooper, which might reasonably have been expected. He still continued under his former prejudices, and no arguments could reach him; and by Martyr's cautioning him against unseasonable and censorious declamations, we may imagine he had played his satire pretty freely against the customs of the Church. And from his conduct in this dispute, we may in some measure collect the strength of his prepossession, and the condition of his judgment. For this incomppliance and liberty in the pulpit, he was first silenced, and confined to his house by the council.

Hooper thought this usage somewhat severe: to miss



his promotion, it is likely was no disappointment, but to be punished because he would not be a bishop, to be persecuted about clothes, and lose his liberty for not being in the fashion, was possibly more than he understood. He ventured, therefore, to take no notice of the order of council, and printed a confession of his faith. He was afterwards committed to the custody of Archbishop Cranmer, who tried to bring him off from his singularities, but without effect. The archbishop complained in a letter to the council, that Hooper was not contented with bare disconformity to the customary practice, but offered to prescribe to the public on this head. Upon this, Cranmer was ordered to send him to the Fleet, which was done accordingly.

At length, however, Hooper complied, although it does not appear how he was persuaded. He seems to have entered into a compromise, but the terms as mentioned by Bishop Burnet, are, as Collier observes, rather remarkable.

This compliance of Hooper, as represented by our learned historian, looks somewhat remarkable. "He was to be attired," says this author, "in the vestments that were prescribed, when he was consecrated, and when he preached before the king, or in his cathedral, or in any public place; but he was dispensed with upon other occasions. If Hooper could conform thus far, one would think there should be little occasion for a dispensation. Besides, if he believed the episcopal habit sinful, which way could he reconcile himself to the wearing it at all? If he did not, what made him scruple appearing in it upon any customary occasion? Why did he affect a singularity against the usages of the Church, and give a precedent of exception? Fox is displeased with Hooper for yielding in this point: he rallies him for his conformity, represents him as a player, and passes an awkward jest upon his habit.

Upon the deprivation of Heath, Bishop of Worcester,

Hooper held the see in *commendam* with his own. This gave his enemies a handle to report him to disadvantage. They wondered, a man that had his conscience so lately embarrassed with little matters, could reconcile himself to two sees; but it is thought Hooper was not much the richer for his double preferment. The courtiers, it is likely, found him passive in parting with the revenues, and took care to ease him of the imputation of an avaricious prelate. Latimer had preached against sacrilege, and therefore, little of this compliance could be expected from him: this, it is probable, was one reason of his not being restored to his bishopric upon Heath's removal. But whether Latimer was overlooked upon this motive, or whether he declined the exercise of his episcopal character, is somewhat uncertain.

As a bishop, although his opinions were extreme, he acted with energy, and with charity; and though a moroseness of manner made him repulsive to strangers, he was esteemed by those who were well acquainted with him.

On the death of Edward, the consistency of his principles was apparent in his loyalty to Mary, whereas too many of the reformers adhered to Lady Jane Grey.

As he had disgraced the episcopacy, by undertaking to hold the office during the royal pleasure, he had no more right to complain of being deprived of his bishopric, under Queen Mary, than a minister of state would have ground of complaint on being called upon to resign, when a new sovereign comes to the throne.

The Romish party had now the ascendancy in the Church of England, and they determined to shew no mercy to the reformers. Their proceedings were marked by injustice as well as by cruelty. He was several times placed under examination, and treated with every kind of insult, while no definite charge was brought against him. At length, he was condemned to suffer death, and the sentence was to be carried into execution at Gloucester.

About four o'clock in the morning of Tuesday, the 5th of February, 1555, the sheriffs of London conducted him from Newgate, to a place near St. Dunstan's Church, in Fleet Street; where six of the royal guard were in readiness to receive him. These men took him to the Angel Inn, by St. Clement's, where he ate a cheerful and hearty breakfast. Having finished their meal the party took to horse; Hooper though somewhat lame, mounting without aid the animal prepared for him. A hood was slouched over his face, in order to prevent people from recognizing him on the road, and his armed attendants constantly inquiring of him what inns he had been used to frequent in his journeys, never failed to take him to a different house. He seems to have reached Cirencester without attracting any particular notice. He arrived in that town to dinner, about eleven o'clock in the morning of Thursday, and was taken, as usual, to an inn where he was likely to be unknown. The landlady of this house had been, moreover, an avowed enemy to his principles, and she had even expressed it as her opinion, that with all his zeal, he would recant, rather than burn. But when she saw him thus meekly going to the slaughter, her heart relented. She wept over his approaching fate, and treated him with the most assiduous attention. After dinner, the party rode forward, and being arrived within a mile of Gloucester, found a large assemblage awaiting its approach. The guard naturally looked upon the crowd, under apprehensions of a rescue, and one of the men pushed on to claim assistance from the civic authorities. The local officers, accordingly, ordered all persons to their houses; but to this injunction was paid very little attention. The people, however, though lamenting loudly the prisoner's case, shewed no disposition for violence. Amidst this gratifying display of popular affection, Hooper was conducted to a private house. He there supped with a good appetite, and retiring to rest, slept soundly. Before the



night was spent, he rose, and engaged in fervent prayer. His chamber having been shared by the guard, he begged, on the following morning, that he might be permitted to pass the day, at his devotions, by himself in the adjoining room. This reasonable request being granted, the willing victim wore away the day, in earnest supplications for strength and mercy, and in meditation upon heavenly things. Upon these interesting exercises his attention was, indeed, fixed so intensely, that it could not readily be called off to worldly matters. While thus absorbed, Sir Anthony Kingston, a former acquaintance, now one of the commissioners for arranging his martyrdom, entered his apartment, and saluted him. Hooper's mind was, however, so completely occupied in prayer, that he heeded not the voice with which he had once been familiar. The knight looked upon him with strong emotion, and bursting into tears, he thus again addressed him: "What, my lord, do ye not know me, an old friend of yours, Anthony Kingston?" By this time, the martyr had recovered his consciousness of surrounding objects, and he courteously replied: "Yes, Master Kingston, I do now know you well, and am glad to see you in health, and I praise God for the same." His visitor then endeavoured to revive his desire to live, by representing that a pardon might be had upon his recantation, adding at the same time, that death is bitter, and life sweet. "I thank you for your friendly council, Master Kingston," said Hooper, "although it is not quite so friendly as I could have wished it. True it is, that death is bitter, and life is sweet: but pray, consider, that the death to come is more bitter, and the life to come more sweet. For the terror and fear, therefore, that I have of the one, and the desire and love that I have of the other, I do not so much regard this death, nor esteem this life. I have settled myself, accordingly, through the strength of God's holy Spirit, patiently to pass through the fiery torments now prepared for me, rather than deny the

truth of His word. And in the meantime, I desire of you, and others, to commend me to God's mercy in your prayers." Kingston mournfully rejoined: "Well then, my lord, I perceive that there is no remedy, and therefore I will take my leave of you; thanking God that ever I knew you: for you were appointed to call me, being a lost child. I have been both a fornicator and an adulterer; but by your good instructions God hath brought me to forsake and detest these heinous iniquities." By this testimony to the efficacy of his ministry, Hooper was deeply moved, and he prayed earnestly, that his visitor might continue stedfastly to the end of his life in habits worthy of a Christian. After much interesting converse, Kingston, with cheeks bathed with tears, bade his former friend farewell. He too wept, and he said, that of all the troubles to which his imprisonment had subjected him, no one had given him half so much pain at that parting. In the evening he was delivered up by the guardsmen, into the custody of the mayor, sheriffs, and aldermen of Gloucester. These magistrates kindly took him by the hand, and courteously saluted him. This mark of amiable feeling highly gratified Hooper, and he expressed himself very thankful, that a company of old acquaintances had not ceased to treat him with affectionate civility, because he was a prisoner, and a condemned man. The municipal authorities proposed to lodge him for the night in the common gaol, but he had won the hearts of his escort from London, and these honest soldiers earnestly besought that he might not be exposed to such an inconvenience. He had shewn himself, they said, while in their custody, so mild and tractable, that a child might manage him; and they offered to answer for his security, during another night, rather than have him deprived of such comforts as his present lodgings afforded. For himself, the martyr seems merely to have requested, that a quick fire should be made at the place of suffering, and that he might be

permitted to retire to rest at an early hour, in order that being refreshed with sleep in the fore part of the night, he might have a considerable space for the vigorous prosecution of his devotions, before the consummation of his earthly trials. It was at length determined that he should not be removed, and at five in the afternoon he sought his couch. After a sound sleep of considerable duration, he rose, and requesting that he might be left alone, until the time of execution, he spent the rest of the night in prayer. About nine in the morning, he was led from his lodgings surrounded by men armed with javelins, and other weapons. On the preceding day, he had assured the civic authorities when they stood plunged in manifest grief around him, that he would give them no sort of trouble, and that if one of them would but hold up his finger, he would immediately desist from doing or saying any thing that might be disliked. He was now, therefore, grieved to see all this parade of force. He said, accordingly, to the magistrates, "I am no traitor, neither needed you to have made such a business to bring me to a place where I must suffer. If ye had willed me, I would have gone alone unto the stake, and have troubled none of you at all." A very large number of persons, not less than seven thousand, as it was estimated, being assembled, he looked upon them, and said: "Alas! why be these people come together? Peradventure, they think to hear something of me now, as they have in times past; but alas! speech is prohibited me. Notwithstanding, the cause of my death is well known unto all of them. When I was appointed here to be their pastor, I preached unto them true and sincere doctrine, and that out of God's Word. Because I will not account the same to be heresy and untruth, therefore this kind of death is prepared for me." Saying these words, he calmly placed himself between the sheriffs, and walked along, leaning upon a staff; an assistance which he was compelled to use on account of



rheumatic affections which had seized his limbs during the long confinement which he had undergone in damp dungeons. His ordinary habit appears not to have been a cheerful one, but now that the mortal temperament was about to clog his spirit no longer, he seemed to enjoy a foretaste of his deliverance, and as it commonly happens to good men upon the brink of eternity, a delightful serenity beamed from his countenance. A strict charge had been given him not to speak, and this he religiously obeyed; although he must have been deeply moved by the loud lamentations which resounded in his ears on every side; and although his eyes rested several times upon faces which he knew. He contented himself, however, upon such recognitions, with bidding farewell by means of a resigned and affectionate look alone. Having reached the spot, where stood the preparations for his painful end, he knelt down, and spent about half an hour in prayer. An attempt was now made to shake his resolution by showing to him the royal pardon, which was regularly engrossed, and awaited his acceptance. "If you love my soul," said he, "away with it." The Lord Chandos, on this observed, : "There is no remedy then;" and he added immediately: "Despatch; quickly." After another brief interval devoted to prayer, the sufferer threw off his gown, and begged of the sheriffs to return it to his host, from whom he had borrowed it. He wished to have mounted the pyre in his doublet and hose, but this indulgence was refused to him, and he was compelled to strip himself to his shirt. When thus prepared for immolation, one of the friendly soldiers who had guarded him from London, came to him with some bags of gunpowder, which had been kindly prepared for placing under his arms, and about other parts of his person. Having disposed these as it was recommended, he requested of the spectators to repeat the Lord's prayer with him, and to pray for him while he should continue in the agonies of death. Instantly arose the voice of

prayer, interrupted by sobs and groans from every quarter of the crowded area. He then ascended to the stake, and irons were brought to fasten him to it. "You need not," said he, "thus to trouble yourselves. I doubt not that God will vouchsafe me strength to abide the fire's extremity without bands." A chain, however, for the waist, he willingly allowed to be drawn around him; admitting that the frailty of his flesh might make him swerve from his position. While standing in momentary expectation of his parting struggle, a stranger approached and intreated his forgiveness. "For what?" asked the martyr. "To my knowledge thou hast never offended me." The man replied: "Oh, Sir, I am appointed to kindle the fire." "Therein," said Hooper, "thou dost nothing offend me. Do thine office; and God forgive thee thy sins." Bundles of reeds were now thrown upon the pile; some of which the sufferer embraced in his arms, and he calmly gave directions for the placing of others. Flame being added to the mass of fuel, its progress was to feeling spectators most painfully slow. Much of the wood was green, and violent gusts of wind blew the devouring element away from the victim. At length, however, the flame mounted, the reeds caught fire, and Hooper's frame was enveloped in a blazing mass. Unhappily, the flame soon died away, and left him scorched, indeed, severely, but affected in no vital part. He was now seen to wipe his eyes, and intensity of pain obliged him to exclaim: "For God's sake, good people, let me have more fire." Upon this appeal was brought a fresh supply of fuel, and soon afterwards the bags of gunpowder exploded; but the violence of the wind, and probably also the wetness of the powder, caused them to have little effect. Hooper's agonies were prolonged through more than three quarters of an hour. He bore this frightful conflict with admirable constancy; moving incessantly his lips in prayer, and beating his breast with his hands, until one of his arms dropped off. Even

then he continued to beat his breast with the remaining hand so long as consciousness remained.—*Foxe. Strype's Memorials, and Cranmer. Collier. Soames.*

## HOORNBEECK, JOHN.

JOHN HOORNBEECK was born at Haerlem in 1617. After studying in his native city, and at Leyden and Utrecht, he entered into the ministry at Cologne in 1632, and eleven years after returned to Holland. In 1644 he was raised to the chair of divinity professor at Utrecht, and appointed minister in ordinary in the church there; and after filling those two important offices with great ability and universal approbation, he was invited to similar employments at Leyden in 1654. He died in 1666. He wrote *Institutiones Theologicæ*; *Irenicum de Studio Pacis et Concordiæ*; *De Consociatione Evangelica inter Reformatos et Evangelicos*; *Socinianismi Confutati, Tomi tres*; *Pro Convincendis et Convertendis Judæis Lib. VIII.*; *De Conversione Gentilium Lib. II.*; *Examen Bullæ Urbani VIII. de Jesuitissis, Imaginibus, et Festis*; *Examen Bullæ Innocenti X. de Pace Germaniæ*; *Epistola ad Duræum de Independentismo*; *Commentarius de Paradoxis Weigelianis*; *Apologia pro Ecclesiâ Christianâ Hodiernâ, contra Libellum, ad Legem et Testimonium*; *De Observando a Christianis Præcepto Decalogi Quarto*; *De Episcopatu*; *Theologiæ Practicæ, Tomi duo*; *Summa Controversarum, &c.*; *Miscella Vetera et Nova.*—*Gen. Dict. Niceron. Freheri Theatrum.*

## HOPKINS, EZEKIEL.

EZEKIEL HOPKINS was born in 1633 at Sandford, in Devonshire, where his father was curate. He became chorister of Magdalen College, Oxford, and usher of the



adjoining school. He was next appointed chaplain of the college. He lived and was educated under Presbyterian and Independent discipline; and about the time of the restoration he became assistant to Dr. Spurstow, of Hackney, one of the authors who wrote under the name of Smectymnus. He was afterwards elected preacher at one of the city churches; the Bishop of London, however, refused to admit him, as he was a popular preacher among the Puritans; but after some time he was settled in the parish church of St. Mary, Woolnoth. Having retired to Exeter on account of the plague, he obtained the living of St. Mary's Church in that city, was countenanced by Bishop Seth Ward, and was much admired for his pulpit eloquence. The Lord Robartes, afterwards Earl of Truro, was so pleased with him, that he gave him his daughter Araminta in marriage, took him with him as his chaplain on his going as Lord lieutenant to Ireland, in 1669, gave him the deanery of Raphoe, and recommended him so effectually to his successor, Lord Berkeley, that he was consecrated Bishop of Raphoe in 1671, and translated to Londonderry in 1681. In a cowardly manner, and like a faithless pastor, he deserted his flock in 1688, when he returned to London, and was elected Minister of Aldermanbury in 1689, where he died in 1690. He published five single sermons; *An Exposition of the Ten Commandments*; and an *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer*; all printed in one volume, 1710, fol.—*Wood. Prince.*

## HORBERY, MATTHEW.

MATTHEW HORBERY was born in 1707, at Haxway, in Lincolnshire, of which parish his father was vicar. He received his earlier education at Epworth, and at Gainsborough, and was then entered of Lincoln College, Oxford, where he obtained a small exhibition, but afterwards was elected to a fellowship of Magdalen.

As a young man, he published "Animadversions on Jackson's Christian Liberty Asserted," in which he was assisted by the great Dr. Waterland, whose friendship he gained by the talent and knowledge which in this excellent tract he evinced. Through Waterland's recommendation, it seems probable that he was brought under the notice of Bishop Smalbroke, who appointed him his chaplain, and collated him successively to the vicarage of Eccleshall, and the curacy of Gnosall, to which were added a canonry of Lichfield, and the vicarage of Hanbury. He was afterwards promoted by his college to the Rectory of Stanlake, where he died in 1773.

His sermons, published in one volume, after his decease, are declared by Bishop Van Mildert to be among the very best compositions of our English divines. In addition to these, he published a Dissertation on the Eternity of future Punishments, and the tract before mentioned, against Jackson.—*Van Mildert's Waterland. Nicholl's Literary Anecdotes.*

#### HORNE, GEORGE.

GEORGE HORNE was born at Otham, near Maidstone, in Kent, November 1, 1730. To his father, who was Rector of Otham, he was indebted for his early education; and he was afterwards at a grammar-school at Maidstone, whence, at the age of fifteen, he removed to University College, Oxford, where he obtained a scholarship. He applied himself closely to study, especially of the Hebrew language, to which he added the perusal of the writings of the Christian fathers. He took his M.A. degree in 1752, and on Trinity Sunday, in the following year, he was ordained.

At an early period of life, he imbibed a favourable opinion of the sentiments of Mr. Hutchinson; which he afterwards adopted and disseminated without disguise.

Supported by the learning and zeal of his friends, Mr. Watson, of University College, Dr. Hodges, provost of Oriel, and Dr. Patten, of Corpus, he ably vindicated his principles against the intemperate invectives to which their novelty exposed them. That part indeed of the Hutchinsonian controversy which relates to Hebrew etymology, was discountenanced by Mr. Horne as, in a great measure, fanciful and arbitrary. He considered it of infinitely more importance to be employed in investigating facts, than to be disputing about verbal criticisms. The principles of Mr. Hutchinson beginning to extend their influence in the university, in 1756, a bold attack was made upon them in an anonymous pamphlet, entitled, "A Word to the Hutchinsonians." Mr. Horne considering himself more particularly called upon for a defence, as being personally aimed at in the animadversions, produced an Apology, which has been universally admired for its temper, learning, and good sense. The question agitated seems rather to involve the very essence of religion, than to concern Mr. Hutchinson or his principles. The pamphlet was attributed by the public in general, and Mr. Horne in particular, to Mr. Kennicott, of Exeter College; a man who had distinguished himself by an accurate acquaintance with the Hebrew, and two masterly dissertations, one on the Tree of Life, the other on the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel.

Horne's Apology is a work which cannot be abridged without injury; as comprehending a great variety of subjects in a small compass. The temper of it appears in the first page. The excellent Hooker had replied to a petulant adversary in the very significant words: "Your next argument consists of railing and reasons. To your railing I say nothing: to your reasons I say what follows." "This sentence," says the apologist, "I am obliged to adopt, as the rule of my own conduct; the author I am now concerned with having mixed with his arguments a great deal of bitterness and abuse, which



must do as little credit to himself as service to his cause. He is in full expectation of being heartily abused in return: but I have no occasion for that sort of artillery: and have learned beside, that *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God*. Therefore, in the words of the excellent Hooker, *to his railing I say nothing: to his reasons I say what follows.*"

To the charge of being an Hutchinsonian, a name so invidiously applied, as a sectarian appellation, to himself and other readers of Hutchinson's writings, he answers, that, as Christians, they acknowledge no Master but one, that is, Christ: that they were members only of the the Church: and that, as all their reading had not formed them into a sect, they ought not to have a mark set upon them. "Is it not hard measure," says he, "that when a clergyman only preaches the doctrines and enforces the duties of Christianity from the Scriptures, his character shall be blasted, and himself rendered odious by the force of a name, which, in such cases, always signifies what the imposers please to mean, and the people to hate? There are many names of this kind now in vogue. If a man preaches Christ, that He is the end of the law, and the fulness of the gospel—'You need not mind him; he is a Hutchinsonian.' If he mentions the assistance and direction of the Holy Spirit, with the necessity of prayer, mortification, and the taking up of the cross—'O, he is a Methodist!' If he talks of the divine right of Episcopacy, without a word concerning the danger of Schism—'Just going over to Popery!' And if he preaches obedience to King George—'You may depend upon it, he is a Pretender's man.' Many things may be ridiculed under their false titles, which it would not be so decent to laugh at under their true ones."

In 1757, Mr. Horne, according to the established custom in Magdalen College, in Oxford, had begun to preach before the university, on the day of St. John the

Baptist. For the preaching of this annual sermon a permanent pulpit of stone is inserted into a corner of the first quadrangle; and so long as the stone pulpit was in use the quadrangle was furnished round the sides with a large fence of green boughs, that the preaching might more nearly resemble that of John the Baptist in the wilderness; and a pleasant sight it was: but many years the custom has been discontinued, and the assembly have thought it safer to take shelter under the roof of the chapel. Our forefathers, it seems, were not so much afraid of being injured by the falling of a little rain, or the blowing of the wind, or the shining of the sun upon their heads. The preacher of 1755 pleased the audience very much by his manner and style, and all agreed that he had a *very fine imagination*: but he was not very well pleased with the compliment. As a *Christian teacher*, he was much more desirous that his hearers should receive and understand, and enter into the spirit of the doctrines he had delivered; but in this he found them slower than he wished, and laments it in a private letter

In 1758, he was chosen a proctor to the university, and at the expiration of his office, he was admitted to the degree of B.D. In 1760, he produced a pamphlet, in which he censured the plan of Kennicott for a new edition of the Hebrew bible; but the literary hostilities of these gentlemen terminated in a lasting friendship. In 1764, he took the degree of D.D.; and in 1768, he was elected president of Magdalen College. Shortly after obtaining this preferment, he married the daughter of Philip Burton, Esq. In 1771, Dr. Horne was appointed chaplain in ordinary to the king, and the next year he displayed his zeal in defence of the thirty-nine articles, by publishing his "Considerations on the projected Reformation of the Church of England; in a letter to Lord North," 4to. His principal and most popular work, the "Commentary on the Book of Psalms," made its

appearance in 1766, in two vols, 4to., when the author was vice-chancellor. "And it happened," says his biographer, Jones, of Nayland, "soon after its publication, that I was at Paris. There was then a Christian university in the place! and I had an opportunity of recommending it to some learned gentlemen who were members of it, and understood the English language well. I took the liberty to tell them, our Church had lately been enriched by a Commentary on the Psalms; the best in our opinion, that had ever appeared; and such as St. Austin would have perused with delight if he had lived to see it. At my return, the author was so obliging as to furnish me with a copy to send over to them as a present; and I was highly gratified by the approbation with which it was received. With those who could read English, it was so much in request, that I was told the book was never out of hand; and I apprehended more copies were sent for. Every intelligent Christian, who once knows the value of it, will keep it to the end of his life, as the companion of his retirement: and I can scarcely wish a greater blessing to the age, than that it may daily be better known and more approved.

About the time when it was published, that systematical infidel, David Hume, died. It had been the aim of his life, to invent a sort of philosophy, that should effect the overthrow of Christianity. For this he lived; and his ambition was to die, or be thought to die, hard and impenitent, yea, and even cheerful and happy; to shew the world the power of his own principles; which however were weakly founded, and so inconsistent with common sence, that Dr. Beattie attacked and demolished them in the life-time of the author. Special pains were taken by Hume himself, and by his friends after him, to persuade the world, that his life, at the last stage of it, was perfectly tranquil and composed; and the part is so laboured and over-acted, that there is just cause of suspicion, even before the detection appears. Dr. Horne,



whose mind was ever in action for some good end, could not sit still, and see the public so imposed upon. He addressed an anonymous *Letter to Dr. Adam Smith* from the Clarendon Press ; of which the argument is so clear, and the humour so easy and natural, that no honest man can keep his countenance while he reads it, and none but an infidel can be angry. While Dr. Adam Smith affects to be very serious and solemn in the cause of his friend Hume, the author of the *Letter* plays them both off with wonderful effect. He alludes to certain anecdotes concerning Mr. Hume, which are very inconsistent with the account given in his life : for at the very period, when he is reported not to have *suffered a moment's abatement of his spirits*, none of his friends dared to mention the name of a certain *author* in his presence, lest it should *throw him into a transport of passion and swearing* : a certain indication that his mind had been greatly hurt ; and nobody will think it was without reason, if he will read the *Essay on Truth* by Dr. Beattie ; which is not only a confutation of Hume's Philosophy ; it is much more ; it is an extirpation of his principles, and delivers them to be scattered like stubble by the winds.

The letter to Dr. Adam Smith, like the *Essay* of Dr. Beattie, has a great deal of truth, recommended by a great deal of wit : and if the reader has not seen it, he has some pleasure in store. We allow to the memory of Dr. Adam Smith, that he was a person of quick understanding and diligent research, in things relating merely to this world ; of which his *Inquiry into the Causes of the Wealth of Nations* will be a lasting monument ; and it is a work of great use to those who would obtain a comprehensive view of business and commerce : but when he set up Mr. Hume as a pattern of perfection, and judged of all religion by the principles of that philosopher, he was very much out of his line.

The *Letter* was followed in course of time by *Letters on Infidelity* : which are very instructive and entertain-

ing, and highly proper for the preventing or lessening that respect which young people may conceive unawares for unbelieving philosophers."

In the year 1781, he had been appointed dean of Canterbury, when he wished to resign his headship of Magdalen. But the college could not part with him. In 1789, he was elected to the See of Norwich.

His biographer remarks that "the last considerable affair in which he concerned himself while dean of Canterbury, was an application from the bishops of the Episcopal Church of Scotland; three of whom, in the year 1789, came up to London to petition parliament for relief from the hard penalties under which they had long suffered. This they ventured to do, in consideration of the loyalty and attachment they had lately professed toward the king and the constitution.

"It was my lot likewise not to be an unconcerned spectator in this business. Through an intimacy which had long subsisted between myself and a gentleman of great worth and learning in the county of Kent (the Reverend Nicholas Brett, of Spring Grove) I became acquainted with the Bishop of Edinburgh, Dr. Abernethy Drummond, of Howthornden, and had frequently corresponded with him. As soon as he came to London with his colleagues on the business aforesaid, he wrote me word of his arrival, and explained the cause of the journey they had undertaken. Being myself of too inconsiderable a station to be of any immediate service to them in a matter of such importance, I thought it the most prudent step I could take, to forward the letter to a great person: who, with his usual goodness and discretion, undertook to be an advocate for them; together with many other persons of high respectability; and their petition was at length brought to such an issue, as excited great thankfulness in the petitioners, though it did not exactly come up to the wishes they had formed at setting out.

“ There was no small difficulty in making some persons understand, who and what these poor petitioners were : and the case, notwithstanding all that has passed, may still be the same with many at this day. I therefore hope to be excused, if I enlarge a little in this place on their history and character, as they appeared, and were known to Dr. Horne ; whose good opinion will be remembered as an honour, and may be of some use to them hereafter.

“ He had considered, that there is such a thing as a pure and primitive constitution of the Church of Christ, when viewed apart from those outward appendages of worldly power, and worldly protection, which are sometimes mistaken, as if they were as essential to the being of the Church, as they are useful to its sustentation. The history of the Christian Church, in its early ages, is a proof of the contrary ; when it underwent various hardships and sufferings from the fluctuating policy of earthly kingdoms. And the same happened to the Episcopal Church of Scotland, at the Revolution in 1688 ; when Episcopacy was abolished by the State, and the Presbyterian form of Church government established. By this establishment the bishops were deprived of their jurisdiction, and of all right to the temporalities of their sees. But in this forlorn state they still continued to exist, and to exercise the spiritual functions of their episcopal character : by means of which, a regular succession of bishops, and episcopally ordained clergymen, has been kept up in Scotland, under all the disadvantages arising from a suspicion of their being disaffected to the crown, and attached to the interest of an exiled family. While attempts were making in behalf of that family, a variety of circumstances rendered it impossible for them to remove this suspicion, notwithstanding the many inconveniences and hardships to which it exposed them. All they could do was to conduct themselves in such a quiet manner, as might at length convince the govern-



ment, they had nothing to fear from a Scotch Episcopal Church, and, consequently, that there was no necessity for the execution of those severe laws, which on different occasions has been enacted against it.

“At last the happy period came, which was to relieve them from this embarrassing situation. The wisdom and clemency of his late Majesty’s government encouraged them to hope, that an offer of their allegiance would not be rejected : and as soon as they could make that offer in a conscientious manner, they had the satisfaction to find by the king’s answer to their address, that it was graciously accepted : in consequence of which, they could not but hope, that the British legislature would take their case into consideration, and see the expediency of relieving both clergy and laity of the episcopal communion of Scotland from the penalties to which they were exposed in the exercise of their religion.

“With this hope, three of the bishops, as I have said, came to London in the year 1789 ; and, notwithstanding the ample recommendations they brought with them from their own country, they found it a work of time to make themselves and their application properly understood. It would have been barbarous, after the die was cast, to have thrown any discouragement in their way : but I was of opinion, from the beginning, that they were come *too soon* : more preparation was requisite than they were aware of. The penal laws had reduced the Scotch Episcopal Church to a condition so depressed and obscure, that it could scarcely be known to exist, but by such persons as were previously acquainted with its history. Among these, none entered more willingly and warmly than the then good dean of Canterbury. As soon as he heard of the arrival of the Scotch bishops at London, he was anxious to let them know how heartily he approved of the object of their journey, and kindly offered every assistance in his power to bring the matter to a happy conclusion. He paid them every mark of

attention both at London and Oxford ; and, when they set out on their return to Scotland, without having attained their object, he expressed, in very affectionate terms, his concern at their disappointment, and told them at parting not to be discouraged : for, said he, ‘ your cause is good, and your request so reasonable, that it cannot long be denied.’

“ In February, 1791, after having taken his seat in the house of lords as Bishop of Norwich, he wrote a friendly letter to Bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen, assuring him and the other members of the committee for managing the business of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, that any help in his power should be at their service : and speaking of their applying anew to both houses of parliament, he said, ‘ It grieved him to think they had so much heavy work to do over again ; but business of that sort required patience and perseverance.’

“ It was said about this time, that the Lord Chancellor Thurlow, withheld his consent to the Scotch episcopal bill, till he should be satisfied by some of the English prelates, that there really were bishops in Scotland. When Bishop Horne was waited upon with this view by the Committee of the Scotch Church, and one of them observed, that his lordship could assure the chancellor they were *good Bishops*, he answered, with his usual affability and good humour, ‘ Yes, Sir, much better bishops than I am.’

“ A clergyman of Scotland, who had received English ordination, applied to him, wishing to be considered as under the jurisdiction of some English bishop ; that is, to be, in effect, independent of the bishops of Scotland in their own country ; but he gave no countenance to the proposal, and advised the person who made it quietly to acknowledge the bishop of the diocese in which he lived, who, he knew, would be ready to receive him into communion, and require nothing of him, but what was necessary to maintain the order and unity of a Christian

Church ; assuring him, at the same time, that, if he were a private clergyman himself, he should be glad to be under the authority of such a bishop. One anecdote more upon this subject, and I have done.

“ From the present circumstances of its primitive orthodoxy, piety, poverty, and depressed state, he had such an opinion of this Church, as to think, that, if the great apostle of the Gentiles were upon earth, and it was put to his choice with what denomination of Christians he would communicate, the preference would probably be given to the Episcopalians of Scotland, as most like to the people he had been used to. This happened, as I perfectly recollect, while we were talking together on the subject of the Scotch petition, on one of the hills near the city of Canterbury, higher than the pinnacles of the cathedral, where there was no witness to our discourse but the sky that was over our heads, and yet, when all things are duly considered, I think no good man would have been angry, if he had overheard us.

“ If the reader should wish to know more of the people of this communion, let him consult an ecclesiastical history of the Church of Scotland, by Mr. Skinner, father to the late worthy Bishop of Aberdeen ; a history comprehending a plain and unaffected detail of facts very interesting and amusing : and I hope he will also be convinced by the narrative I have here given, not only that the bishops of Scotland are true Christian bishops, but that the bishops of England, from the part they kindly took in the affair, do little deserve the clamour which some have raised against them, as if they were so dazzled by their temporalities, as to lose sight of their spiritual character, and bury the Christian bishop in the peer of parliament.” He died on the 17th of June, 1792.

HORNECK, ANTHONY.

ANTHONY HORNECK, was born at Baccharack, in the



Lower Palatinate, in 1641, and educated in divinity at Heidelberg, under Spanheim. At the age of nineteen he came over to England, and entered at Queen's College, Oxford. He was made chaplain of his college, and vicar of All Saints, Oxford; and two years after he went as tutor to the eldest son of the Duke of Albemarle, by whom he was made rector of Doulton, in Devonshire, and prebendary of Exeter. After a visit of two years in Germany, he was, in 1671, appointed to the Church of St. Mary-le-Savoy. This edifice had originally been the chapel of an hospital, into which Henry the Seventh had converted the ancient Savoy palace. In the reign of Edward the Sixth, when the Duke of Somerset pulled down the parish church of St. Mary in the Strand, in order to make way for his magnificent palace, the Savoy Chapel was used as the parish church. In the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Savoy became a parish in itself, a certain precinct, comprising a small population, being assigned to the care of the minister. It appears, however, that Dr. Horneck had also the spiritual charge of the adjoining parish of St. Mary, since his biographers represent him as labouring in a populous district; and one of his works is dedicated to his "beloved parishioners, the inhabitants of St. Mary-le-Strand, and the precincts of the Savoy."

Here he was animated, affectionate, and pathetic in his preaching. "He spoke from his own heart," says Bishop Kidder, "and pierced the hearts of his hearers. . . . He soon convinced the people that he was in good earnest, and that he had a mighty sense of the worth of souls, and of the vast importance of those truths which he delivered to them. He used great freedom of speech, and instead of using enticing words of human wisdom, he spake, like his Master, with great conviction and authority. His auditors were convinced that he was a man of God, and sent by Him for the good of souls."

One of his sayings was, that the clergy must be like Gideon's soldiers, "carry trumpets of sound doctrine in one hand, and lamps of good lives in the other." He lived in the affections of his parishioners: his church was so well attended, that it was often "no easy matter to get through the crowd to the pulpit;" and a very large number of devout communicants bore testimony that God was bestowing a blessing upon his labours. His friend, Kidder, who was himself a parochial minister in London, speaks thus of his attention to this branch of his duty. "He administered the holy communion on the first Sunday of every month, and preached a preparation sermon on the Friday preceding. He did it also on the great festivals. He administered it twice on a day; in the morning at eight o'clock, and at the usual time after the morning sermon. The number of the communicants held a great proportion to that of his auditors, and their devotion was very exemplary. The number was so great at both times, that it will hardly be believed by those clergymen who have been confined to the country, and have seen the small number of those who attended upon this holy service. So great was the number, that there was need of great help of clergymen to assist in the delivering of the bread and wine; and with such assistance, it was very late before the congregation could be dismissed. I will add, that I do not remember that I did ever behold so great numbers, and so great signs of devotion, and a due sense and profound reverence, becoming this great act of divine worship, in my whole life. The doctor took indefatigable pains, on these occasions, but he was encouraged to do so from the great success his labours met withal."

It was his constant endeavour to provoke the people of whom he had the charge, to love and to good works. He was unwearied in his exertions and prayers for the sick and dying. And he laboured with that zeal which might be expected from one who could conscientiously assert,

that his greatest affliction was the failure of his attempts to wean the people from sin, and bring them to God. In short, he had so much business generally upon his hands that he had hardly time to eat his meal.

He was often applied to for advice and consolation by persons troubled in mind; and, on these occasions, he treated each case with discrimination and delicacy, always pausing to reflect, as he expresses it, "when it was proper to use the rod, and when to use the staff." He would sometimes introduce these cases of conscience as topics of conversation with his friend Kidder; and "I do solemnly declare," says the bishop, "that I never heard him deliver his opinion, but I was entirely satisfied with it."

In the reign of King James the Second, when preparations were manifestly being made for restoring popery in this kingdom, Dr. Horneck spared no exertions to resist the flood, which he knew to be full charged with evil to the temporal and eternal interests of men. After the revolution, we find him employed in the gratifying office of receiving back, into the bosom of the Church, a clergyman who had, for a while, weakly deserted her. The person referred to was Edward Sclater, whom Mr. Evelyn denominates "an apostate curate of Putney," and who was in fact the vicar of that parish. Desiring to be received back into the communion of the Church, he applied to Dr. Horneck, of whose judicious conduct in the matter we are enabled to judge, by his *Account of Mr. E. Sclater's Return, &c., and of the public Recantation he made at the church of St Mary-le-Savoy, May 5, 1680.*

"It was about the beginning of April last," says Dr. Horneck, in that narrative, "that Mr. Sclater sent a friend of his to me, to desire me to admit him to the communion at the Savoy; and the motive alleged was, that he had not only given my lord Archbishop of Canterbury satisfaction in the sincerity of his repentance, but was ready to make a free and formal retractation of



his former errors before me; and to assure me that nothing but conviction and evidence, and a clearer sight of the truth, had wrought this conversion in him. And the reason, he said, why he chose to receive the eucharist at the Savoy was, because he intended to live thereabout, in a house of his own, and then to betake himself to such employment as he should be capable of."

Dr. Horneck could not but feel apprehensive that the total failure of the attempts of the papists might have occasioned this new change in Mr. Sclater's views; but at the same time, feeling that he ought to be pleased at the return of the straying sheep, and much more of a shepherd who had lost his way, he resolved to consult the Bishop of London (Compton), and the archbishop (Sancroft); the latter of whom directed that the most offensive passages of a book written by Sclater, and the confessions and acknowledgment of his letters, should be collected for a public recantation; and the archbishop's chaplain, assisted by Dr. Horneck, carried this suggestion into effect.

When the appointed day arrived, Mr. Sclater read his recantation aloud after morning service, and evidently was deeply affected. A psalm was then sung; at the end of which Dr. Horneck read a short address, announcing that, since Mr. Sclater made such a profession of repentance, it had been agreed that he should be admitted to lay communion, in accordance with the apostle's instruction to restore one who had been overtaken in a fault, in the spirit of meekness. He then proceeded to remind them, that to judge of the heart was the province of God alone; and appealed to the penitent himself, to do as much good by his future life and conversation, as he had done harm by his late unhappy example. An appropriate sermon was then preached by the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Burnet.)

At this period, certain societies were formed, for which see the *Life of Bishop Beveridge*. Several of these

societies fixed upon Dr. Horneck to be their spiritual adviser; and their designs and proceedings may be inferred from the following rules, which he drew up for the regulation of their meetings:—

1. All that enter the society shall resolve upon a holy and serious life.—2. No person shall be admitted into the society until he has arrived at the age of sixteen, and has been first confirmed by the bishop, and solemnly taken upon himself, his baptismal vow.—3. They shall choose a minister of the Church of England to direct them.—4. They shall not be allowed, in their meetings, to discourse of any controverted point of divinity.—5. Neither shall they discourse of the government of Church or state.—6. In their meetings they shall use no prayers but those of the Church, such as the litany and collects, and other prescribed prayers; but still they shall not use any that peculiarly belongs to the minister, as the absolution.—7. The minister whom they choose shall direct what practical divinity shall be read at these meetings.—8. They may have liberty, after prayer and reading, to sing a psalm.—9. After all is done, if there be time left, they may discourse each other about their spiritual concerns; but this shall not be a standing exercise which any shall be obliged to attend unto.—10. One day in the week shall be appointed for this meeting, for such as cannot come on the Lord's day; and he that absents himself without cause shall pay three-pence to the box.—11. Every time they meet, every one shall give sixpence to the box.—12. On a certain day in the year, viz., Whit-Tuesday, two stewards shall be chosen, and a moderate dinner provided, and a sermon preached; and the money distributed (necessary charges deducted,) to the poor.—13. A book shall be bought, in which these orders shall be written.—14. None shall be admitted into this society, without the consent of the minister who presides over it; and no apprentice shall be capable of being chosen.—15. If any

case of conscience shall arise, it shall be brought before the minister.—16. If any member think fit to leave the society, he shall pay five shillings to the stock.—17. The major part of the society shall conclude the rest.—18. The following rules are more especially recommended to the members of this society, viz.—To love one another. When reviled, not to revile again. To speak evil of no man. To wrong no man. To pray, if possible, seven times a-day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their coming in and going out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual and temporal.

Bishop Kidder was not able to pronounce whether Dr. Horneck “did move these young men at first to enter into such societies, or whether they first applied to him, and he only gave them rules to govern themselves by.” But the cautious manner in which he here provided for the cultivation of brotherly kindness, humility, candour, and the spirit of meekness, will commend his regulations to the admiration of all, particularly of those who are aware that consequences of an opposite nature have unhappily grown out of societies formed for the same important purposes, but conducted with less wisdom and foresight.

Dr. Horneck continued in narrow circumstances till within three years of his death. In 1689, indeed, Archbishop Tillotson particularly recommended him to the patronage of Lady Russell, as a person well qualified to hold the living of Covent Garden, which then became vacant by the promotion of dean Patrick, the incumbent, to the Bishopric of Chichester. It appears, however, that some of the parishioners declared themselves hostile to the appointment (a circumstance which we can only attribute to the political animosities just referred to,) upon which Lady Russell, with the full concurrence of



the archbishop, conferred the benefice upon another clergyman.

But in 1692, Admiral Russell, taking leave of the queen shortly before the battle of La Hogue, particularly requested the royal favour for Dr. Horneck. The queen, after having made some inquiries, and consulted her frequent adviser, Archbishop Tillotson, promised the next vacant stall in Westminster Abbey; which promise she fulfilled in the following year.

This elevation did not abate his zeal for the spiritual welfare of his parish. "He was now," says the bishop, "in better circumstances as to the world than he had been, but not less diligent and laborious. He went on in his Master's work with most unwearied labour, and spent his whole time and strength in it. And it was his delight and his choice." Although his new residence could not have been more than a mile from his parish, he constantly spent one or two days every week at his former house, "on purpose to attend upon those poor, and afflicted, and scrupulous people, that resorted thither for help and advice." Besides these, he devoted other days to the discharge of his ordinary ministerial duties, taking the same care of his flock as before, and teaching them publicly, and from house to house.

In 1694, he resigned a small prebendal stall which he held in Exeter Cathedral, and was appointed to another at Wells, by his friend, Bishop Kidder. "But I fear," says the bishop, "he made no advantage of it, his charges considered; or if he did, it was very small."

Unwearied application to the work of the ministry shortened the term of Dr. Horneck's life. In the year 1678, a long and languishing illness had brought him well nigh to the grave. But it pleased God to raise him up again; and in some papers found after his decease, he attributed his recovery to the affectionate care of his wife, and the fervent prayers of pious people. In gratitude to God for this preservation from death, he set apart

a monthly day of memorial in his family; and every year he preached a commemoration sermon at the Savoy, in which he recounted God's mercies to him, and excited the congregation to hope and trust in the same gracious Father in like extremities; thus making the providential dispensations of God fruitful of permanent benefit to himself and those who heard him.

He lived, indeed, many years, to observe these devout memorials of his rescue from death; but the burden of his pastoral labours wore him out prematurely.

He died of the stone, in 1696. Bishop Kidder thus describes his last moments:—"On Sunday morning, January the 31st, he was worse than ever he had been, insomuch that those about him thought him dying at eleven in the morning. I was then at Westminster Abbey, and was sent for out of the church to pray with him. I found him very sensible. I asked him if he was aware that he was dying; he replied that he was. I asked him if he were also resigned and willing to die; he replied, very readily, that he was willing to die. I asked him whether he had considered the words, Heb. ii. 14, 15, and whether or not he found himself delivered from all the slavish fear of death; he replied very quick, looking up to heaven, that he was delivered from that fear. He was in an excellent frame, and joined with the prayers which the Church appoints on such occasions, with great expressions of devotion. Some time after this, I found him delirious, and not long after, speechless. After some few hours' groans he expired, at eight o'clock that evening, being then about the fifty-sixth year of his age."

The mortal remains of Dr. Horneck were buried on the 4th of February, in Westminster Abbey, his funeral being attended by several of the bishops and eminent clergymen, as well as by a great concourse of persons who had held him in high estimation.

Dr. Horneck, we are told, kept a continual watch over his

soul, examining minutely its principles, and the conduct which it dictated. A diary was found after his death, from which it appeared that he called himself to a strict account every night, for the thoughts, words, and actions, of the day past. If he had done any good that day, he gave God the praise for it before he slept; "and few men that lived," says the bishop, "passed fewer days, if he passed any such, without doing good." But when any words or thoughts which he could recall to his memory, seemed to betray a want of care and consideration, he reproached himself severely before he lay down to rest. Easily as he could forgive his enemies, he was slow to excuse himself, and while he was to others one of the kindest of men, to himself he was strict and severe.

He looked upon this practice of daily self-examination as highly conducive to a Christian's growth in grace, and pronounced it to be "the best preservative against the infection of any sin whatsoever."

He was anxious for continual advances from strength to strength. "Work hard!" he declares, "is the Christian's motto, and there is nothing that implies a greater contradiction than idleness and Christianity." "Shall any man," he asks, "talk of ease and softness, that in his baptism hath vowed himself to a continual warfare, and engaged himself to fight under the banner of Jesus? The time of rest is to come, the present time is designed for labour and trouble."

The ordinary exercises which he recommended as conducive to godliness, were, "To pray always; every morning to resolve to tie ourselves to certain rules of living that day; every day to spend half an hour, or some such time, in thinking of good things; to study deep humility; to bridle our tongues; to watch against little sins; to keep a strict guard over our eyes; to make good use of the virtues and vices of our neighbours; to put a charitable interpretation upon what we see and hear; con-



scientiously to discharge the duties of our several callings and relations; to resist all sorts of temptations; to stand in awe of God, when we are alone and no creature sees us; to do all things to God's glory; to stir up and exercise the graces God hath given us; every night before we go to bed, to call ourselves to an account for the actions of the day."

He was also of opinion that great benefit resulted to those who occasionally bound themselves by solemn vows and promises, and who subdued the body by strict fasting and other severe discipline.— *Hone. Kidder.*

## HORSLEY, SAMUEL.

Of this distinguished prelate a minute biography is much to be desired; the following is taken from Chalmers, and has evidently been written with care:—

Samuel Horsley was the son of the Rev. John Horsley, M A., who was for many years clerk in orders at St. Martin's in the Fields. His grandfather is said to have been at first a dissenter, but afterwards conformed, and had the living of St. Martin in the Fields. This last circumstance, however, must be erroneous, as no such name occurs in the list of the vicars of that church. His father was in 1745 presented to the rectory of Thorley in Hertfordshire, where he resided constantly, and was a considerable benefactor to the parsonage. He also held the rectory of Newington Butts, in Surrey, a peculiar belonging to the Bishop of Worcester. By his first wife, Anne, daughter of Dr. Hamilton, principal of the college of Edinburgh, he had only one son, the subject of the present article, who was born in his father's residence in St. Martin's Church-yard, in October, 1733. By his second wife, Mary, daughter of George Leslie, Esq., of Kimragie, in Scotland, he had three sons and four daughters, who were all born at Thorley. He died in

1777, aged seventy-eight; and his widow in 1787, at Nasing, in Essex.

Samuel was educated in his early years chiefly by his father, and we are assured, never was at Westminster School, as has been asserted; but of this and the other transactions of his youth, his studies, and early character, we have very few particulars that can be depended on, and have failed in obtaining information on these subjects from the only quarter whence it could have been expected. It is certain, however, that he was entered of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where it is easy to conceive that he was an industrious student, applying himself much to the study of mathematics, and storing his mind with the writings of the ancient and modern divines and logicians. Why with such qualifications he took no degree in arts, cannot now be ascertained. We find only that he took that of L.L.B. in 1758, and became his father's curate at Newington, to which living he succeeded, on the resignation of his father, in the following year, and held it till his translation to the see of Rochester, in 1793.

In April, 1767, he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, of which he continued for many years an active member; and in the same year he published a pamphlet, entitled "The Power of God, deduced from the computable instantaneous productions of it in the solar system," 8vo. This he allows to be a "very singular, and perhaps a whimsical speculation," and says, in language not uncharacteristic of his future style, that in all probability this production would "roll down the gutter of time, forgotten and neglected." His object was undoubtedly to display the wonderful power of God; but it was thought that he magnified omnipotent power at the expense of omniscient wisdom, and instead of supposing that the planets continue for ever to perform their courses, in consequence of the Almighty *fiat* and original impulse impressed upon them, when first they were drawn out of

chaos, he maintains the necessity of a new force every instant to preserve the system in motion.

In 1768, he went to Christ Church, Oxford, as private tutor to Heneage, Earl of Aylesbury, then Lord Guernsey. To this university he appears to have become attached; and his first mathematical publication was elegantly printed at the Clarendon press, "*Apollonii Pergæi inclinationum libri duo. Restituebat S. Horsley,*" 1770. This work was criticised with some severity at the time, but does not appear to have injured his rising reputation, especially with the members of the royal society, who chose him to the office of secretary, in November, 1773. In 1774, he was incorporated B.C.L. at Oxford, and immediately proceeded to the degree of D.C.L., and was presented by his patron, the Earl of Aylesbury, to the rectory of Aldbury, in Surrey, with which he obtained a dispensation to hold the rectory of Newington. In the same year he published "*Remarks on the Observations made in the late Voyage towards the North Pole, for determining the acceleration of the Pendulum, in latitude  $79^{\circ} 51'$ .*" In a letter to the Hon. Constantine John Phipps," 4to. His intentions in this pamphlet, which ought ever to be bound up with "*Phipps's Voyage,*" is to correct two or three important errors and inaccuracies that had been introduced by Israel Lyons, the mathematician employed on the voyage, in the numerous mathematical calculations which appear in that valuable work; and this it was acknowledged, was performed by our learned author with equal skill, delicacy, and candour.

Dr. Horsley had long meditated a complete edition of the works of Sir Isaac Newton, and in 1776 issued proposals for printing it, by subscription, in 5 vols, 4to, having obtained the royal permission to dedicate it to his majesty; but the commencement of it was for a considerable time delayed by severe domestic affliction, arising from the illness of his wife, for whom he had the



tenderest regard. She died in the following year, and some time after, the works of Newton were put to press, but were not finally completed until 1785. In the meantime his great diligence and proficiency in various sciences attracted the notice of an excellent judge of literary merit, the late Dr. Lowth, Bishop of London, who on his promotion to that see, in 1777, appointed Dr. Horsley his domestic chaplain; and collated him to a prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral. He also, by the same interest, succeeded his father as clerk in orders at St. Martin's in the Fields.

In 1778, during the controversy between Priestley, Price, and others, respecting materialism, and philosophical necessity, Dr. Horsley preached a sermon, on Good Friday, April 17, entitled, "Providence and Free Agency," 4to, in which he drew a very acute distinction between the philosophical necessity of our subtle moderns, and the predestination of their ancestors. It was evident he had an eye to the writings of Dr. Priestley in this discourse, but that polemic did not take any immediate notice of it. In 1779, Dr. Horsley resigned Aldbury, and in 1780, Bishop Lowth presented him to the living of Thorley, which he held, by dispensation, with Newington, but resigned the former on being appointed Archdeacon of Essex, and in 1782, vicar of South Weald in that county, both which he owed to the same patron. In 1783, we find him deeply involved in a dispute with some of the members of the royal society, not worth reviving in a regular narrative; it is only to be regretted that it ended in his withdrawing himself from the society.

Dr. Horsley was now about to enter on that controversy with Dr. Priestley, in which he displayed his greatest learning and abilities, and on which his fame is irremovably founded. In the year 1782 (we use Dr. Horsley's words,) an open and vehement attack was made upon the creeds and established discipline of every Church in Christendom, in a work in 2 vols. 8vo., en-

titled, a "History of the Corruptions of Christianity." At the head of these Dr. Priestley placed both the catholic doctrine of our Lord's divinity, and the Arian notion of his pre-existence in a nature far superior to the human, representing the Socinian doctrine of his mere humanity, as the unanimous faith of the first Christians. It seemed to Dr. Horsley that the most effectual preservative against the intended mischief would be to destroy the writer's credit, and the authority of his name, which the fame of certain lucky discoveries in the prosecution of physical experiments had set high in popular esteem, by a proof of his incompetency in every branch of literature connected with his present subject, of which the work itself afforded evident specimens in great abundance. For this declared purpose, a review of the imperfections of his work in the first part, relating to our Lord's divinity, was made the subject of Dr. Horsley's Charge, delivered to the clergy of the Archdeaconry of St. Alban's, at a visitation, held May 22, 1783, the spring next following Dr. Priestley's publication. The specimens alleged by Dr. Horsley of the imperfections of the work, and the incompetency of the author, may be reduced to six general classes. 1. Instances of reasoning in a circle. 2. Instances of quotations misapplied through ignorance of the writer's subject. 3. Instances of testimonies perverted by artful and forced constructions. 4. Instances of passages in the Greek fathers, misinterpreted through ignorance of the Greek language. 5. Instances of passages misinterpreted through the same ignorance, driven further out of the way by an ignorance of the Platonic philosophy; and 6. Instances of ignorance of the phraseology of the ancient ecclesiastical writers. Dr. Horsley concludes this masterly and argumentative Charge, by saying, "I feel no satisfaction in detecting the weaknesses of this learned writer's argument, but what arises from a consciousness, that it is the discharge of some part of the duty which I owe to the Church of

God." The whole of this Charge affords a characteristic specimen of Dr. Horsley's controversial style, with a mixture of temper leading him, perhaps, somewhat nearer the bounds of irony than became the solemnity of an address of this kind. After speaking of many things that may be perfectly obvious to the penetration of such a mind as Dr. Priestley's, how absurd and contradictory and improbable soever they may appear to persons of plain sense and common understandings, unsubtilized by sophistry and metaphysics, and not stimulated by the love of paradox, he observes, that, to those who want the doctor's sagacity, the "true meaning of an inspired writer" will not very readily be deemed "to be the reverse of the natural and obvious sense of the expressions which he employs."

Dr. Priestley, however, felt none of the alarm with which his admirers were affected. He promised an early and satisfactory answer. He predicted that he should rise more illustrious from his supposed defeat; he promised to strengthen the evidence of his favourite opinion by the very objections that had been raised against it; he seemed to flatter himself that he should find a new convert in his antagonist himself, and even hinted in print somewhat concerning the shame and remorse with which he was confident his adversary must be penetrated. From all this it soon became evident that Dr. Priestley, who could not but feel personally what every unprejudiced man felt argumentatively, that Dr. Horsley was an antagonist of no mean stamp, did not profit by this conviction so far as to take sufficient leisure to revise his own writings, but immediately repeated his former assertions respecting the doctrine of the Trinity *not* having been maintained by the Christian Church in the first three centuries, in a publication entitled, "Letters to Dr. Horsley, in answer to his Animadversions on the History of the Corruptions of Christianity: with an additional evidence that the primitive Christian Church



was Unitarian," 1783, 8vo. In this there are more of the weaknesses of argument, and the errors of haste, than could have been expected from one who had so much at stake, and it was therefore no very difficult task for Dr. Horsley to continue the contest, in the same epistolary form which his antagonist had adopted, by "Letters from the Archdeacon of St. Alban's, in Reply to Dr. Priestley, with an Appendix, containing short strictures on Dr. Priestley's Letters, by an unknown hand," 1784, 8vo. These letters are seventeen in number, and their object is to prove that if Dr. Priestley's mistakes which he pointed out, are few in number, they are too considerable in size to be incident to a well-informed writer; that they betray a want of such a general comprehension of the subject as might have enabled Dr. Priestley to draw the true conclusions from the passages he cited; that they prove him incompetent in the very language of the writers from whom his proofs should be drawn, and unskilled in the philosophy whose doctrines he pretended to compare with the opinions of the Church. These are serious charges, but our author did not confine himself merely to substantiate them, but followed up his numerous proofs by others in behalf of the doctrine of the Trinity, drawn from the early fathers of the Church, and the best ecclesiastical historians. The display of reading and research in these letters is wonderful. The style also is admirable, and while it assumes the lofty and somewhat dictatorial manner peculiar to Dr. Horsley, and which indeed the high ground on which he stood in this case, seemed to justify, the reader of taste finds himself often charmed with the elegance of the language, and always with the closeness of the reasoning.

Dr. Priestley, in his letters, had expressed a great desire to draw Dr. Horsley into a tedious controversy on the main question, the article of our Lord's divinity, but our author, knowing that question to have been long since exhausted, and that nothing new was to be said

on either side, chose, in his "Letters in Reply," to adhere closely to *his own* main question. He, therefore, as we have mentioned, defended his own argument, and collected new specimens from Dr. Priestley's new publication, of his utter inability to throw light upon the subject. Thus a useless and endless contention on the main question was avoided; but many discussions necessarily arose upon secondary points, which perhaps the learned reader will esteem the most interesting part of the controversy, such as, the authority of the writings that go under the name of the apostolical fathers; the rise of the two sects of the Nazarenes and Ebionites; the difference between the two; and the difference of both from the orthodox Hebrew Christians; and particularly an article on the accusation of Tritheism, which Dr. Priestley had brought against the Trinitarians of the seventeenth century. The "Short Strictures on Dr. Priestley" in the appendix to these Letters, it is now known, were written by Dr. Townson.

Dr. Priestley (we still use his antagonist's words,) mortified to find that his letters had failed of the expected success; that Dr. Horsley, touched with no shame, with no remorse, remained unshaken in his opinion; and that the authority of his own opinion was still set at nought, his learning disallowed, his ingenuity in argument impeached; and what was least to be borne—finding that a haughty Churchman ventured incidentally to avow his sentiments of the divine commission of the episcopal ministry, and presumed to question the authority of those teachers who usurp the preacher's office without any better warrant than their own opinion of their own sufficiency, lost all temper. A second set of "Letters to the Archdeacon of St. Alban's" appeared in the autumn of 1784, in which all profession of personal regard and civility was laid aside. The charge of insufficiency in the subject was warmly retorted, and "the incorrigible dignitary" was taxed with manifest misrep-

resentation of his adversary's argument; with injustice to the character of Origen, whose veracity he had called in question; and with the grossest falsification of ancient history. He was stigmatized in short as a "falsifier of history, and a defamer of the character of the dead."

Regardless of this reproach, Dr. Horsley remained silent for eighteen months. A sermon "On the Incarnation," preached in his parish church of St. Mary, Newington, upon the feast of the Nativity, in 1785, was the prelude to a renewal of the contest on his side, and was followed early in the ensuing spring by his "Remarks on Dr. Priestley's second Letters to the Archdeacon of St. Alban's, with proofs of certain facts asserted by the archdeacon." This tract consists of two parts; the first is a collection of new specimens of Dr. Priestley's temerity in assertion; the second defends the attack upon the character of Origen, and proves the existence of a body of Hebrew Christians at Ælia, after the time of Adrian—the fact upon which the author's good faith had been so loudly arraigned by Dr. Priestley. With this publication Dr. Horsley promised himself that the controversy on his part would be closed. But at last he yielded, as he says, with some reluctance, to collect and republish what he had written in an octavo volume (printed in 1789) and took that opportunity to give Dr. Priestley's Letters a second perusal, which produced not only many important notes, but some disquisitions of considerable length; and the remarks on Dr. Priestley's second letters having produced a *third* set of "Letters" from him, upon the two questions of Origen's veracity, and the orthodox Hebrews of the Church of Ælia: these two are partly answered in notes, and partly in two of the disquisitions. Towards the conclusion of Dr. Horsley's "Remarks," after exhibiting specimens of Dr. Priestley's incompetency to write on such subjects as fell within their controversy, he says, "These and many other glaring instances of unfinished criticism, weak argument,



and unjustifiable art, to cover the weakness and supply the want of argument, which must strike every one who takes the trouble to look through those second letters, put me quite at ease with respect to the judgment which the public would be apt to form between my antagonist and me, and confirmed me in the resolution of making no reply to him, and of troubling the public no more upon the subject, except so far as might be necessary to establish some facts, which he hath somewhat too peremptorily denied, and to vindicate my character from aspersions which he hath too inconsiderately thrown out." It ought not to be forgotten, that in this controversy Dr. Horsley derived not a little support from the Rev. Mr. Badcock, whose criticisms on Dr. Priestley's works in the *Monthly Review* left scarcely any thing unfinished that was necessary to prove his errors as a divine, and his incompetency as a historian.

The reputation Dr. Horsley had now acquired, recommended him to the patronage of the Lord Chancellor Thurlow, who presented him to a prebendal stall in the church of Gloucester; and in 1788, by the same interest, he was made Bishop of St. David's, and in this character answered the high expectations of eminent usefulness which his elevation to the mitre so generally excited. As a bishop, his conduct was exemplary and very praiseworthy. In this diocese, which was said to exhibit more of ignorance and poverty than that of any other in the kingdom, he carried through a regular system of reform. He regulated the condition of the clergy, and proceeded to a stricter course with respect to the candidates for holy orders, admitting none without personally examining them himself, and looking very narrowly into the titles which they produced. With all this vigilance, his lordship acted to them as a tender father, encouraging them to visit him during his stay in the country, which was usually for several months in the year, assisting them with advice, and ministering to their temporal necessities

with a liberal hand. In his progress through the diocese, he frequently preached in the parish churches, and bestowed considerable largesses on the poor. He was, in short, a blessing to his people, and they followed him with grateful hearts, and parted from him with infinite reluctance.

Bishop Horsley's first Charge to the clergy of St. David's, delivered in 1790, was deservedly admired, as was his animated speech in the house of lords, on the Roman Catholic bill, May 31, 1791. These occasioned his subsequent promotion to the see of Rochester, in 1793, and to the deanery of Westminster, on which he resigned the living of Newington. As dean of Westminster, he effected some salutary changes. Finding the salaries of the minor-canon and officers extremely low, he liberally obtained an advance, and at the same time introduced some regulations in the discharge of their office, which were readily adopted.

During the turbulent period of 1793-4 5, &c. when the religion, government, and morals of the country were in imminent danger from the prevalence of democratic principles, the warmth and zeal of his endeavours in parliament to oppose the enemies of the constitution, procured him a considerable share of illiberal censure, which, however, was more than balanced by the general applause which followed the steady uniformity, consistency, and manly decision of his conduct. As a senator he was deservedly considered in the first class; and there were few important discussions, not only on ecclesiastical topics, but on those which concerned the civil interests of the country, in which he did not take an active part. He was not, however, an every-day speaker, nor desirous of adding to the debates unless he had something original to produce, and he was on that account listened to with eagerness even by those with whom he could not act, and who found it easier to arraign his manner than his matter. In 1802, he was translated to the Bishopric of

St. Asaph, and resigned the deanery of Westminster. During all this period his publications were frequent, as we shall notice in a list of them; and his vigour of body and mind was happily preserved until the year 1806, which proved his last. In July of that year he went to his diocese, a part of which he had visited and confirmed, and after two months' residence intended to visit his patron, Lord Thurlow, at Brighton, where he arrived Sept. 20, after hearing on the road that his noble friend was dead. On the 30th, a slight complaint in his bowels affected him, and very soon brought on a mortification, which proved fatal Oct. 4, in his 73rd year. His remains were interred in the parish church of St. Mary Newington, where a monument has since been erected to his memory, with an inscription written by himself.

He was twice married: first to Mary, one of the daughters of the Rev. John Botham, his predecessor at Aldbury, by whom he had one daughter, who died young, and a son, the Rev. Heneage Horsley, rector of Gresford, in Denbighshire, prebendary of St. Asaph, and chaplain to the Scotch Episcopal Church at Dundee. By his second wife, who died the year before him, he had no children. She is commemorated in the above inscription by the name of Sarah only.

Bishop Horsley's works not yet mentioned, were, besides various occasional Sermons and Charges, 1. "On the properties of the Greek and Latin languages," 1796, 8vo, without his name. 2. "On the Acronychal Rising of the Pleiades," a dissertation appended to his friend Dr. Vincent's "Voyage of Nearchus," 1797. 3. "A circular Letter to the diocese of Rochester, on the Scarcity of Corn," 1796. 4. Another Circular Letter to that diocese, on "the Defence of the Kingdom," 1798. 5. "Critical Disquisitions on the 18th chapter of Isaiah: in a letter to Edward King, Esq., F.R.S., &c." 1799, 4to. Towards the close of this discussion, in which he applies the words of Isaiah to the aspect of the times, he says,



with almost a prophetic spirit, "I see nothing in the progress of the French arms which any nation fearing God, and worshipping the Son, should fear to resist: I see every thing that should rouse all Christendom to a vigorous confederate resistance. I see every thing that should excite *this country* in particular to resist, and to *take the lead* in a confederacy of resistance, by all measures which policy can suggest, and the valour and opulence of a great nation can supply." 6. "Hosea, translated from the Hebrew; with notes, explanatory and critical," 1801, 4to. Archbishop Newcome, in his "Improved Version of the Minor Prophets," had preceded Bishop Horsley in translating Hosea; but our prelate has thought proper in ~~so~~ many instances to reject his emendations, that Bishop Horsley's labours will probably be thought indispensable to a just illustration of the sacred text. This was reprinted with large additions in 1804. 7. "Elementary Treatises on the Fundamental Principles of practical Mathematics; for the Use of Students," 1801, 8vo. These tracts were at first composed, without any design of publication, for the use of his son, then a student of Christ Church; and the work was to be considered, although then first published, as the third and last in the order of the subject, of three volumes of elementary geometry, to be issued one after another from the university press of Oxford. The first accordingly appeared in 1802, under the title of "Euclidis Elementorum Libri priores XII. ex Commandini et Gregorii versionibus Latinis," Oxon. 8vo; and the second in 1804, "Euclidis datorum liber, cum additamento, necnon tractatus alii ad geometriam pertinentes," *ibid.* 8vo.

Since his death have appeared, "Sermons," 1810 and 1812, 3 vols 8vo; "Tracts in controversy with Dr. Priestley, upon the historical question of the belief of the first ages in our Lord's Divinity, originally published in the years 1783, 1784, and 1786: afterwards revised and

augmented, with a large addition of notes and supplemental disquisitions; by the author. The third edition. To which is added, an Appendix, by the Rev. Heneage Horsley," 1812, 8vo; "The Speeches in Parliament of Samuel Horsley, &c." 1813, 8vo; and lastly, "The Charges delivered at the several visitations of the dioceses of St. David's, Rochester, and St. Asaph," 1813, 8vo. In this enumeration of his printed works, a few temporary tracts of lesser importance may probably have escaped us, as being published without his name; but a complete edition of his works, for which there is likely to be a demand, will supply this deficiency. His papers in the Philosophical Transactions would form a very necessary part of such a collection. It may also be noticed here, that he occasionally wrote some very elaborate criticisms in the "British Critic," the plan and principles of which Review he cordially approved.—*Chalmers*.

#### HORT, JOSIAH.

JOSIAH HORT was born towards the close of the 17th century, and probably of a dissenting family, as he was educated at a dissenting school, between 1690 and 1695. On leaving school, he resided for some time as chaplain with John Hampden, Esq., M.P. for Buckinghamshire, and afterwards settled as a dissenting minister at Marshfield, in Gloucestershire. The time of his conformity, and the manner of his conversion, are not known; but it is certain that he was a clergyman of the Church of England in 1708, when he published a sermon which he had preached at the archdeacon's visitation at Aylesbury. He afterwards went to Ireland as chaplain to the lord-lieutenant, and was consecrated Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin in 1721—was translated to Kilmore and Ardagh in 1727, and was advanced to the archiepiscopal see of Tuam in 1742, with the united Bishopric of Enaghdoen,

and with liberty to retain his other Bishopric of Ardagh. He died in 1751, at a very advanced age. He published *Sixteen Sermons*, 8vo., Dublin, 1738, (these were reprinted in London, 1757); and *Instructions to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tuam*, at the primary visitation, July 8, 1742.—*Toulmin*.

## HORTON, THOMAS.

THOMAS HORTON was born in London, and educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1637 he was appointed one of the twelve university preachers. The following year he was chosen master of Queen's College, and in July of the same year minister of St. Mary Colechurch, in London, a donative of the Mercer's Company, of which his father was a member. In October, 1641, he was elected professor of divinity at Gresham College, and in May, 1647, he was elected preacher to the honourable society of Gray's Inn, of which he was also a member. In 1649, he was created D.D., and the ensuing year was chosen vice-chancellor of Cambridge. In August, 1652, he was incorporated D.D. in the university of Oxford; and the year following he was nominated one of the triers or commissioners for the approbation of young ministers. When the Savoy conference was appointed, he was nominated as an assistant on the side of the Presbyterians, but, according to Baxter, he never sat among them; and although one of the number of the divines ejected by the Bartholomew Act, he conformed afterwards, and in June, 1666, was admitted to the vicarage of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, which he held till his death, in March, 1673. After his decease were published, *Forty-six Sermons upon the whole eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, fol.; *A choice and practical Exposition, upon the 4th, 47th, 51st, and 63rd Psalms*; *One hundred select Sermons*



upon several texts, with the author's life by Dr. Wallis, 1679, fol.—*Chalmers*.

#### HOSIUS, STANISLAUS.

STANISLAUS HOSIUS was born in 1503, at Cracow. He became successively secretary to the King of Poland, canon of Cracow, Bishop of Culm and of Warmia. Having succeeded in persuading the Emperor Ferdinand to continue the council of Trent, he was rewarded by Pope Pius IV. with a cardinal's hat. He died in 1579.

His works were published in 2 vols, folio, 1584. He wrote, *Confessio Catholicæ Fidei*; this has been often published in various languages: *De Communione sub utraque Specie*; *De Sacerdotum Conjugio*; *De Missâ vulgari Linguâ celebrandâ*, &c. His works were first collectively published at Cologne, in 1584.—*Moreri Dupin*.

#### HOSPINIAN, RODOLPH.

RODOLPH HOSPINIAN was born at Altorf, in the canton of Zurich, in 1547. Having received a liberal education at Zurich, Marpurg, and Heidelberg, he entered the ministry in 1568, and three years afterwards obtained the freedom of the city of Zurich, and was made provisor of the Abbey School there. In 1576, he was made provisor of the Caroline Schools, and minister of a church near Zurich. While in this situation he devoted his leisure hours to the compilation of a voluminous and elaborate work, which he printed occasionally in different portions, under the title of a "History of the Errors of Popery," but did not live to complete it. This and another treatise, written against the Jesuits, and entitled "*Historia Jesuitica*," procured him, in 1588, the archdeaconry of

the Caroline Church. At the expiration of six years he was farther preferred to be pastor of the Abbey Church, where he continued to officiate till within three years of his death, although a cataract deprived him of sight for more than a twelvemonth during the interval. In 1613, the operation of couching restored his vision; but in 1623, being then seventy-six years of age, his faculties failed him, and though he survived till 1626, his last three years were passed in a state of childish imbecility.

He wrote:—*De Templis: hoc est, de Origine, Progressu, Usu, et Abusu Templorum, ac omnino Rerum omnium ad Tempia pertinentium*, 1587, fol.; *De Monachis: seu de Origine et Progressu Monachatus et Ordinum Monasticorum*, 1588, fol.; *De Festis Judæorum, et Ethnicorum: hoc est, de Origine, Progressu, Ceremoniis, et Ritibus Festorum Dierum Judæorum, Græcorum, Romanorum, Turcarum, et Indianorum*, 1592, fol.; *Festa Christianorum, &c.* 1593, fol.; *Historia Sacramentaria: hoc est, Libri quinque de Cœnæ Dominicæ primæ Institutione, ejusque vero Usu et Abusu, in Primævâ Ecclesiâ; necnon de Origine, Progressu, Ceremoniis, et Ritibus Missæ, Transubstantiationis, et aliorum pene infinitorum Errorum, quibus Cœnæ prima Institutio horribiliter in Papatu polluta et profanata est*, 1598, fol.; *Pars altera: de Origine et Progressu Controversiæ Sacramentariæ de Cœnâ Domini inter Lutheranos, Ubiquistas, et Orthodoxas, quos Zuinglianos seu Calvinistas vocant, exortæ ab anno 1517 usque ad 1602 deducta*, 1602, fol. These are all of them parts of his great work, which he enlarged in succeeding editions, and added confutations of the arguments of Bellarmine, Baronius, and Gretser. What he published on the Eucharist, and another work, entitled, *Concordia Discors, &c.* printed in 1607, greatly exasperated the Lutherans. He lastly turned his arms against the Jesuits, and published *Historia Jesuitica: hoc est, de Origine, Regulis, Constitutionibus, Privilegiis, Incre-*

mentis, Progressu, et Propagatione Ordinis Jesuitarum. Item, de eorum Dolis, Fraudibus, Imposturis, Nefariis facinoribus, cruentis Consiliis, falsâ quoque, Seditiosâ et sanguinolentâ Doctrina, 1619, fol.—*Bayle. Moreri.*

HOTTINGER, JOHN HENRY.

JOHN HENRY HOTTINGER was born at Zurich, in 1620. He studied at Geneva, Gottingen, and Leyden, where he applied himself with such diligence and success to the oriental languages as to become one of the first scholars of his time. After visiting England, he returned to Zurich in 1642, and was immediately appointed professor of ecclesiastical history; and in the following year professor of catechetical divinity, and of the oriental languages. In 1653, he was made professor of rhetoric, and admitted into the college of canons. His great reputation occasioned his being invited by the elector palatine to Heidelberg, to aid in the restoration of that university. He went thither in 1655, after having taken the degree of D.D. at Basil. He was appointed professor of divinity, and principal of the college of Wisdom, and raised to the dignity of ecclesiastical counsellor. The next year he was created rector of the university; and in 1658, he accompanied the prince palatine to the electoral diet of Frankfurt, where he formed an acquaintance with the famous orientalist, Job Ludolph. In 1661, he returned to Zurich, when he was appointed president of the committee for the revision of the German translation of the Bible. He was sent to Holland in 1664, on some political mission; and in 1667, while preparing for a temporary removal to Leyden, where he was offered the professorship of divinity, he was accidentally drowned by the oversetting of a boat, in the neighbourhood of Zurich.

Besides his *Exercitationes Anti-Morinanae*, &c., 1664, 4to, intended to combat father Morin's opinion of the



superiority of the Samaritan Pentateuch to the Hebrew text, which Bayle notices as the author's first production, observing, after father Simon, that, we may call it his master-piece, Hottinger wrote: *Thesaurus Philologicus, seu Clavis Scripturæ*, 1649, 4to, in the second edition of which the Samaritan, Arabic, and Syriac, are all given in their proper characters; *Historia Orientalis, ex variis Orientalium Monumentis collecta, &c.*, 1651, 4to; *Promptuarium, sive Bibliotheca Orientalis, exhibens Catalogum sive Centurias aliquot tam Auctorum, quam Librorum Hebraicorum, Syriacorum, Arabicorum, et Ægyptiacorum; addita Mantissa Bibliothecarum aliquot Europæarum*, 1658, 4to, (Baillet finds fault with this on account of its numerous inaccuracies;) and *Etymologicum Orientale, sive Lexicon Harmonicum Heptaglotton*, 1661, 4to. A catalogue of his other works may be seen in the *Bibliotheca Tigurina*, or the Latin Life of Hottinger, published by Heidegger, at Zurich, 1667, and digested into regular order.—*Bayle. Moreri.*

## HOUBIGANT, CHARLES FRANCOIS.

CHARLES FRANCOIS HOUBIGANT, a distinguished French priest of the congregation of the oratory, was born in 1636, at Paris. An incurable deafness made study his only resource for amusement, and his progress in literature was in consequence so great as to procure him the expressed approbation of his pontiff, Benedict XIV. The fruits of his learned labours are: Translations of the Hebrew Psalter, and of all the books contained in the Old Testament, into Latin, the former printed in 1746, in 12mo, the latter in seven 8vo. volumes. In 1753, he published also at Paris a complete edition of the Hebrew Bible, with notes, and a Latin translation, in four folio volumes.

He died on the 31st October, 1783, at the advanced

age of ninety-eight. Besides his grand work, he published: A Latin Translation of the Psalter, from the Hebrew; a Latin Translation of the whole Old Testament; Hebrew Roots; An Examination of the Psalter of the Capuchins; a French translation of an English book, by Forbes, entitled, Thoughts on Natural Religion; and a French translation of Sherlock's Sermons, and of Leslie's Short and Easy Method with the Deists. Houbigant was a warm advocate for reading the Hebrew without points, according to the system of Masclaf.—*Dict. Hist. Sævi Onomast.*

## HOUGH, JOHN.

JOHN HOUGH was born in Middlesex, in 1651, and, after receiving his earlier education at Birmingham, entered at Magdalen College, in 1669, where he became fellow. At the breaking out of the popish plot, he was unjustly suspected, and his papers were examined; but he did not lose his popularity, and he attended his patron, the Duke of Ormond, to Ireland, and at his return in 1685, he obtained a prebend at Worcester.

At the end of March, 1687, the presidentship of Magdalen College became vacant, and was to be filled up thirteen days after by an election, of which statutable notice was issued. King James the Second, who, in his zeal for Popery and absolute rule, had already stretched his prerogative beyond law, and to acts of violence in civil and ecclesiastical matters, availed himself of this occasion for putting to the test that passive obedience which the university in a public declaration had just before professed. He therefore sent a royal mandate, through Lord Sunderland, president of the council, recommending the fellows of the college to elect Mr. Antony Farmer, and containing a dispensation of any statute or custom which stood in his way. To these

letters a temperate and loyal answer was returned, stating, without any allusion to the king's dispensing power, the unfitness and incapability of Mr. Farmer for the office by reason of their statutes, and praying, either to be left to their conscience, or for the recommendation of a more serviceable person. The election was postponed for two days, that a reply might be received, but none being made, except that the king expected obedience, Mr. Hough was on the fifteenth of April chosen and pronounced president with the usual solemnities, two only of the seniority with whom the election ultimately rested declaring *viva voce* for Mr. Farmer, one of whom was in the following reign executed for high treason. He was without loss of time presented to the visitor of the college, Dr. Mews, the Bishop of Winchester,—confirmed by him, and installed afterwards in due form in the chapel of the college.

This proceeding was naturally calculated to bring down on the Society the king's displeasure; and no time was lost in taking steps to avert it, by laying a representation before him shewing the reason and necessity of their conduct, and also by the intercession of their visitor, and of the Duke of Ormond. But all was to no purpose; and they were summoned to appear by deputation in the newly erected and illegal court of his majesty's commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, assembled at Whitehall, to account for their disobedience.

The apology made by the deputies on this occasion was of the same tenor and substance with their previous statements; not only proving Mr. Farmer's disqualifications for the office of president, by his immoral and irreligious conduct, of which undeniable evidence was produced, and by his never having been a fellow either of Magdalen or New College; but denying the king's power to grant, or their own to accept, any dispensation whatever, either of a statute to which they had sworn obedience on their entry into the society, or of the oath



itself, which they had then made to obey the statutes, and consent to no dispensation of any kind or degree. At the same time they declared their readiness to have complied (as had often been their practice) with the mandatory letters of the king, had the person recommended been in every way qualified by the ordinances of the founder.

In spite of this, and without any reason assigned, the election of Mr. Hough was declared an undue one, and therefore void: and the sentence, which was accompanied by a suspension of two of the senior fellows, and an inhibition to fill up any office, which was followed by another royal mandate with the same dispensation, recommending, not Mr. Farmer, of whose profligacy and irreligion the government began to be ashamed, but Dr. Samuel Parker, then Bishop of Oxford, a creature of the court, and an open professor of popery, who was equally incapable by the statutes of being elected to the situation of president.

The society resisted this second command with equal firmness, having now, besides the inviolability of their statutes and oaths, other reasons for their non-compliance, in the actual occupation of the office by Mr. (now Dr.) Hough, and the personal interest he had acquired in it as his freehold. Nor could they be induced by the presence of the king himself, who went to Oxford in the following month to enforce obedience, to depart from the line they had hitherto pursued.

The interview, indeed, between the king and the fellows, who had been summoned to meet him at Christ Church, the deanery of which was held by Dr. Parker, together with the Bishopric of Oxford, served to shew in stronger colours the virtuous zeal and high sense of duty which restrained the one from an act of deliberate perjury, and the intemperate and tyrannical spirit of the other which would oblige them to it. A petition, couched in the most humble and loyal terms, was tendered to his majesty by

the fellows on their knees, which he would not accept, accompanying his refusal with the most gross threats and unjustifiable language.

No part was taken in these proceedings by Dr. Hough, but an account was sent to him at Astrop Wells of the issue of this conference, of the inexorable anger of the king, and of the charges which he had laid against the society of having been an "undutiful, unmannerly, refractory, and turbulent body" for a great period of years.

The king issued an order for proceeding against the college, by a writ, *quo warranto*. And notwithstanding various attempts to conciliate or intimidate the college, both parties were determined, the king to assail, and Dr. Hough and the fellows to maintain their rights. The court determined upon a visitation of the college by a commission, and this brought into full play that intrepidity, courage, prudence, and temper, which has endeared the memory of Dr. Hough to the latest posterity.

The lords commissioners specially appointed to this purpose were Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, (*see his Life*,) Lord Chief Justice Wright, and Mr. Baron Jenner, who arrived in Oxford on the 20th of October, 1687, attended by three troops of horse, which quartered in the place, and proceeded the next morning to the business on which they had been sent, a regular citation having been previously issued for the appearance of the "pretended" president and the fellows at the same time.

The scene exhibited this day at the College Hall, and on the following in the Common Room, at the close of which the sentence of amotion already decreed at Whitehall was confirmed by the erasure of Dr. Hough's name from the college books, was calculated by its novelty and singularity, and the demeanour of those who were standing in judgment, to excite the highest interest and admiration in the persons who witnessed it.

The affair was opened by a speech from the Bishop of Chester, the design of which was, by promises of royal

favour and threats of punishment hereafter as well as here, to induce compliance. But the three doctrines which he urged—that unconditional and unlimited obedience was a tenet of the Church of England—that colleges and all other corporations were the creatures of the crown—and that it was insolence to bring forward local statutes in contempt of the king, by whose authority they were made—prove of themselves the spirit by which he was animated.

The greater part of both days was occupied in an examination chiefly of Dr. Hough in a variety of points arising out of the past transactions, the tone of whose answers was throughout temperate but inflexible; nor could the arbitrary and overbearing conduct of the commissioners prevent him from declaring, that they would submit to their visitation no further than was consistent with “the laws of the land, and the statutes of the college,” and that “by the grace of God he never would admit of any alteration from the statutes whatsoever.”

The substance of his reply to the reiterated charges of contempt and disloyalty rested, as far as concerned the society, on the perpetual obligation of their oaths from which no power could loose them, and of their statutes to which obedience was due and indispensable, except in things which, such as the saying of mass, were in themselves unlawful. His personal refusal to obey the former decree was grounded on the fact of his having been condemned, without hearing or summons, to part with a freehold, of which nothing could dispossess him but an act of law or a college statute. At the conclusion of the whole, the keys of the lodgings were demanded of him, which he peremptorily refused to surrender, denying the visitatorial power claimed by the commissioners, and doubting that of the king himself. After three solemn but vain admonitions to him to depart peaceably, the sentence of amotion was executed; not, however, without a manly and dignified “protest” against the iniquity of



all the proceedings, and an "appeal to the king in his courts of justice."

The whole deportment, indeed, of Dr. Hough, throughout this important contest, was worthy of admiration. It was not a factious spirit, or a lawless desire of insubordination, which gave birth to his opposition to the king's pleasure. His whole language and demeanour were that of a man well trained in the best principles of allegiance to his sovereign, submission to the laws, and a dutiful regard to the constituent authorities. Yet he spoke and acted as a freeman of England, whose rights are established by law, and are secured against any encroachments on private property, by barriers which no power on earth may break down with impunity.

The rest of the society, with few exceptions, partook of the same patriotic feeling, as was testified by what was styled a "tumultuous, seditious, and insolent" murmur of approbation which followed Dr. Hough's appeal, which also incensed the commissioners so highly, that they bound him over, as having occasioned it by his carriage and language, in a bond of £1,000, to answer for it in the court of king's bench.

The removal of Dr. Hough was immediately succeeded by the instalment of Bishop Parker's proxy by the commissioners alone: and, to crown the whole, a forcible entry was made into the lodgings of the president on the 25th of October, and possession of them given to Parker. "A proceeding this, which was viewed," says Burnet, "with just indignation by the nation as well as the university. It was thought an open piece of burglary and robbery, when men, authorised by no legal commission, came and turned men out of their possessions and freeholds."

Out of twenty-eight fellows, only two at all submitted to these proceedings. The rest firmly and resolutely supported their president and the statutes, conducting themselves at the same time with that personal respect

to the commissioners which obtained their approbation, though in return they had been treated by them at various times with great contempt.

At this sessions, one of the senior fellows was expelled, who had been most strenuous in opposing the whole proceeding, and particularly in answering the plea advanced by the commissioners, that the king's mandate to elect one person implied an inhibition to elect another; and a second was suspended for being more bold than the rest in his answers to the commissioners. And at an adjourned meeting in the following month, to which all the fellows had been summoned, after a long speech full of threats, intimidation, and reproach, from the Bishop of Chester, and many vain efforts to induce them to sign an humble petition and submission, the rest, except two, were deprived and expelled. And still further, on the 10th of December, a proclamation was issued from the ecclesiastical court at Whitehall, decreeing that they and Dr. Hough were incapable of being admitted to ecclesiastical preferment, and, where it might not have taken place, to ordination. This, with the expulsion of fourteen demies in January, for refusing to appear to the summons of the new president, closed these arbitrary and unlawful measures.

Parker, however, enjoyed but little benefit from his new situation. His house was nearly empty and deserted, and five months had scarcely elapsed from the day of his installation before he left the president's chair again vacant by his death. This was a fair opportunity to the king for treading back his steps, and restoring to a private corporation of his subjects their free and infeasible privileges. But his infatuation had risen so high, that the same spirit which urged him to defy the public voice in his persecution of the bishops, and the seizure of the charter of the city of London, prompted him here also to persevere in his unjust course. And in conformity with it, a man of the name of Bonaventure

Gifford, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and a secular priest, much less qualified than the two former for the situation, was instantly appointed to it.

But he, likewise, was not destined to stay in it long. The time had at length arrived when the people at large, sensible of the danger into which religion and liberty had fallen, gave open encouragement to an invasion of the kingdom by the Prince of Orange, and anxiously looked forward to a revolution of their government, which would regain them the rights of which they were now gradually despoiled. Nay, so far was this feeling spread, that when at last the king, by information in all quarters, was certified of the storm which threatened him, the steps which he took to secure his throne were made too late. He became indeed so full of alarm, and so conscious of his past error and present danger, that his eagerness for concession was now more violent than his pertinacity had been before.

And amongst the faults he hastened to amend, was his unconstitutional interference with the society of Magdalen College. The visitor of the college was accordingly desired to settle it regularly and statutably, which was done after a short delay. And it is a singular fact, that the day on which Dr. Hough and his fellow-sufferers were restored to all their privileges, rights, and immunities, was the anniversary of that of their expulsion. Thus ended an unhappy contest, whose issue not only encouraged other societies similarly constituted (more particularly that of King's College, in Cambridge,) to relieve themselves from the encroachments which had gradually been made upon the rights of private corporations, but seemed to set at rest the question as to the visitatorial interference with a private college, having a special visitor, being a branch of royal prerogative.

In 1690, William III. nominated him to the see of Oxford, and in 1699 he was translated to Lichfield. On Tenison's death, he, through modesty, declined the



primacy, but two years after, 1717, he accepted the see of Worcester, where he continued upwards of twenty-six years. He died in 1743, in his ninety-third year, and in the fifty-third of his episcopate.—*Wilmot. Russell.*

HOUTEVILLE, CLAUDE FRANCIS.

CLAUDE FRANCIS HOUTEVILLE, a French writer, was born at Paris. He became a member of the congregation of the Oratory, and afterwards secretary to the Cardinal Dubois. He was also appointed perpetual secretary to the French Academy, and died in 1742. He published in 1722, "*La Verité de la Religion Chretienne prouvée par les Faits*," 3 vols. A work which had a wonderful, but scarcely deserved popularity, at one time.—*Moreri.*

HOWE, JOHN.

JOHN HOWE was born at Loughborough, in Leicestershire, in 1630. He received his education at Christ College, Cambridge; but after taking his bachelor's degree, removed to Brasen-Nose College, Oxford, where he became Bible clerk. Afterwards he was made a demy and fellow of Magdalen College; and, in 1652, took his degree of master of arts. When ordained, he was settled as minister of Great Torrington, in Devonshire, till Cromwell appointed him his domestic chaplain. On the death of Oliver he returned to Torrington, from which living he was ejected at the Restoration. After this he lived some time in the family of Lord Massarene, in Ireland; and, in 1675, became pastor of a congregation in London. In 1685, he went abroad, and officiated in the English Church at Utrecht; but when James II. published his declaration for liberty of conscience, he returned to London, where he died, in 1705.

He published, *The Blessedness of the Righteous laid open, and further recommended for the Consideration of the Vanity of this Mortal Life; A Treatise of delighting in God; The Living Temple, or a designed Improvement of that Notion, that a Good Man is the Temple of God; The Reconcilableness of God's Prescience of the Sins of Men, with the Wisdom and Sincerity of his Counsels and Exhortations, and whatsoever other Means he uses to prevent them; A View of Antiquity, presented in a short, but sufficient Account of some Fathers, &c.; Of Thoughtfulness for To-morrow, with an Appendix concerning the Immoderate Desire of foreknowing Things to come, &c.; Annotations on the three Epistles of St. John, published in the second volume, or Continuation of Pool's Annotations; A calm and sober Enquiry concerning the Possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead, &c.; The second Part of the Living Temple, containing Animadversions on Spinoza, and a French writer pretending to refute him, &c.; and numerous Sermons, together with a few controversial treatises in support of his own Treatise on the Trinity, &c.* All his works were printed together, in 2 vols, fol., 1724, with a *Life of the author* prefixed, drawn up by Calamy.—*Calamy.*

## HOWELL, LAURENCE.

LAURENCE HOWELL, an unfortunate nonjuring divine, was born soon after the Restoration, and educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A. in 1684, and that of M.A. in 1688. In 1712, he was ordained and instituted into priest's orders by Dr. Hickes, who was entitled suffragan Bishop of Thetford.

The letters of orders were thus expressed:—*Tenore Præsentium, Nos Georgius Hickes, permissione divinâ Episcopus Suffraganeus Thetfordiensis, notum facimus universis, quod nos præfectus Episcopus, in Oratorio*

Nostro, in Parochiâ Sancti Andreæ Holbourn in comitatu Middlesex, sacros ordines, præsidio divino celebrantes, Dilectum Nobis, in Christo Laurentium Howell, A.M., de vitæ suæ probitate morumque integritate nobis sufficienti Testimonio Commendatum, et sacrarum literarum cognitione et scientia laudabiliter institutum, et per nostrum examinatore[m] nobis approbatum, ad sacrum Presbyteratûs ordinem, juxta morem et consuetudinem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ in hac parte salubriter editam et provisam, admisimus et promovimus: ipsumque instituimus et ordinavimus tunc et ibidem. In cujus rei testimonium Sigillum Nostrum Episcopale præsentibus apponi fecimus, secundo die Mensis Octobris, Annoque Domini Millesimo Septingentesimo Duodecimo, Nostræque Consecrationis 18<sup>o</sup> Georgius Hickes.

Before this, in 1708, he had published, *Synopsis Canonum SS. Apostolorum, et Conciliorum œcumenicorum et provincialium, ab Ecclesia Græca receptorum*, 1710, fol.; *Synopsis Canonum Ecclesiæ Latinæ*, fol. Soon after he printed a pamphlet, entitled, *The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated*, which was intended to be dispersed or sold privately, there being no name of any author or printer. This was discovered by the crown messengers when searching for a paper called, "*The Shift Shifted*," and Howell was committed to Newgate. He naturally argued, that the complying clergy were schismatics. Redmayne, the printer, was indicted for printing the book, which was denominated a libel: and Dalton was fined, imprisoned, and sentenced to the pillory, for printing the *Shift Shifted*. Howell was tried and convicted at the Old Bailey, being sentenced to a fine of £500, three years imprisonment, to be whipped, and to be degraded and stripped of his gown by the hands of the public executioner. He asked, "Who will whip a clergyman?" but the court replied: "We pay no deference to your cloth, because you are a disgrace to it, and have no right to wear it: besides, we



do not look upon you as a clergyman, in that you have produced no proof of your ordination, but from Dr. Hickes, under the denomination of the Bishop of Thetford : which is illegal, and not according to the constitution of this kingdom, which has no such bishop." The executioner was ordered to pull off his gown at the bar, which was accordingly done. The pamphlet was probably intended only for private sale or gratuitous distribution. All his papers were seized by order of the government.

The degrading part of the sentence was remitted by his majesty : but the prisoner died in Newgate, in 1720. Whatever may have been his conduct with respect to the government, it appears, that his punishment was far heavier than the offence merited. His various works testify that he was a man of most extensive acquirements. His *Synopsis Canonum* is a most valuable production. Two volumes were published, the one in 1709, the other in 1710 : and a third was actually in the press, when it was accidentally destroyed by fire. In 1715, however, the third volume was announced in the following manner : "The MS. copy of the third and last volume of Mr. Howell's *Synopsis Can. Concil. Eccles. Græc. Lat.* being burnt in White Friars, Jan. 1712, this is to give notice, that Mr. Howell hath once more finished the third volume." The author was not discouraged by the loss of one copy of his manuscript, but immediately commenced the laborious task of re-writing the volume. One of his works, *The History of the Pontificate*, is directed against the pretensions of Rome, and may be appealed to in refutation of the silly charge of Popery against the Nonjurors. In the preface he says, "Among the many remarkable impresses of truth our Church bears, it is one, that she does not blindfold her proselytes, but leaves them the use of their faculties ; and does not, by intruding on them an implicit belief, force them to lay down their reason, when they take up their faith."

He also published a well-known History of the Bible, 3 vols, 8vo, with a hundred and fifty engravings, by Sturt; and, The Orthodox Communicant.—*Lathbury. Nichols's Bowyer.*

#### HOWSON, JOHN.

JOHN HOWSON was born in London, in 1556, and educated at St. Paul's School, and at Christ Church, Oxford. He was vicar of Bampton, in Oxfordshire, rector of Brightwell, in Berkshire, a fellow of Chelsea College, and canon of Hereford. When vice-chancellor of Oxford, he exerted himself against those Puritans who opposed the discipline and ceremonies, but was afterwards a more distinguished writer and preacher against Popery. James I. commanded his polemical discourses, which are the most considerable of his works, to be printed in 1622, 4to. They are all in the form of sermons. He was first Bishop of Oxford, and in 1628 he was translated to Durham. He died in 1631.—*Wood. Hutchinson's Durham.*

#### HUBERT, MATTHEW.

MATTHEW HUBERT was born in 1640, at Chatillon, on the Maine. He was a priest of the congregation of the Oratory, and acquired great fame as a preacher. He died in 1717. His sermons were published at Paris, in 6 vols. 12mo., 1725.—*Dict. Hist.*

#### HUET, PETER DANIEL.

PETER DANIEL HUET, who is to be regarded more as a man of literature than a theologian, was born at Caen,

in Normandy, in 1630. The early death of his parents left him at the mercy of guardians, who neglected him ; but by the direction of his tutor, Mambrun, a Jesuit, he became well acquainted with literature, and particularly with geometry, and, with the assistance of Bochart, the Protestant minister of Caen, he made himself master of the Greek and Latin classics, and in 1652, he accompanied him to the court of Christina, Queen of Sweden. The queen wished Huet to settle at Stockholm, but after three months' stay, he took his leave of the fickle princess, and returned to Paris. In 1661, he published his *De Interpretatione Libri duo*, the design of which was to confine within due limits the licence of translators, especially those of the Scriptures. His *Origenis Commentaria*, of which he had obtained a copy from a MS. while at Stockholm, appeared in 1668 at Rouen, with a Latin translation and notes. In 1669, he was invited by Christina to Rome, whither she had, after her abdication, retired ; but he declined her liberal offers. In 1670, he was appointed, with Bossuet, sub-preceptor to the Dauphin. In 1678, he was nominated by Louis XIV. to the Abbey of Aunay, in Normandy, and in 1685, he was raised to the see of Soissons.

"At this time," says Huet "momentous disputes existed between the courts of Rome and France, the causes of which it is unnecessary here to relate. The consequence was, that almost all intercourse of business between the two was broken off ; and seven years elapsed after I was nominated Bishop of Soissons, in which every product and grant of papal letters was withheld, and with the empty title of episcopacy I was without all right of exercising its functions ; whilst, in the meantime, there existed great disturbance in ecclesiastical affairs, the flocks of the faithful being in different parts neglected and deserted, and the succession of pastors interrupted."

The principal subject of these disputes, so cautiously



touched upon by Huet, was the *regale*, a prerogative assumed by the kings of France to present to all the simple benefices of a diocese during the vacancy of a see, and to dispose at pleasure of the revenues of the bishopric. With this were mixed certain points of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and certain decisions of the assembly of French clergy in favour of the independence of the crown and Church. The pope, Innocent XI., opposed all these attacks upon the supremacy and authority of the see of Rome, with a violence and pertinacity that at one time seemed likely to effect a separation of the kingdom of France from the papal dominion; but the scruples of the king, enforced by his Jesuit confessors, and by the bigotry of his advancing years, prevented these extremities, and in the end produced a compromise in which the advantage remained to Rome.

Huet was in fact never consecrated Bishop of Soissons; before he could obtain from Rome the papal diploma, he had effected a change of the diocese of Soissons, for that of Avranches, to which he was consecrated in 1692. "This province," he says, "I administered nearly ten years, and I had nothing more at heart than to restore the relaxed discipline of a diocese which had for so long a time been without a bishop. Wherefore, having maturely weighed the regulations of the ancient prelates, which are commonly termed Synodal Statutes, and having collected others from various sources, I drew up and duly promulgated a new set. And as in process of time my flock became better known to me at the diocesan assemblies which were annually convoked, I curbed rising disorders by new injunctions. But I found at length, by my own experience, that he undertakes a task of infinite labour, and almost beyond the power of man to sustain, who attempts to administer the episcopal office, according to its real importance, to watch over the salvation of souls, to destroy the ger-

minations of vice, to promote the growth of virtue, to defend the purity of piety and religion, and to form himself to those morals which may present a rule of life to his whole flock."

The truth is, that he was entirely unfitted for the episcopal office, or for an active station, neither does he seem, notwithstanding the passage just quoted, to have had his heart in the pastoral office. In fact, he had become habitually so much the man of letters, that he was unfitted for an active station. We are told that when persons came to him about business, they were constantly informed that his lordship was at his books, and could not be disturbed; upon which one of them exclaimed, "Why did not the king give us a bishop who had finished his studies?"

He therefore obtained permission of the king, in 1699, to abdicate his bishopric, and his majesty conferred on him the abbacy of Fontenai, near the gates of Caen, but he afterwards removed to the maison professé of the Jesuits at Paris, where he spent the last twenty years of his life in literary pursuits. He died in 1721. His other works are: *Demonstratio Evangelica*, often reprinted; *Censura Philosophiæ Cartesianæ*; *Quæstiones Alnetanæ de Concordiâ Rationis et Fidei*; *De la Situation du Paradis Terrestre*. He also wrote notes on the Vulgate translation of the Bible, for which purpose he read over the Hebrew text twenty-four times; and in 1718, he published an account of his life.—*Huet's Auto-Biography*.

#### HUGH, OF CLUNI.

HUGH of Cluni, a Romish saint, was born in Burgundy, in 1023. At fifteen years of age, he embraced the monastic life at Cluni, where he became prior, and at last abbot, of his order, which he greatly reformed

and extended. He died in 1108. Some of his epistles are extant, in Dacheri Spicilegium. There are other pieces by him in the Bibliotheque de Cluni.—*Dupin*.

#### HUGH DE FLEURY.

HUGH de Fleury, or de St. Marie, was a monk of the Abbey of Fleury, in the eleventh century. His works are:—1. De la Puissance Royale, et de la Dignité Sacerdotale. This work may be found in the Miscellanea of Beluze. 2. A Chronicle, or History, from the Creation to 840. 3. Another, from 996 to 1109, printed at Munster, in 1638, 4to.—*Dupin*.

#### HUGH DE FLAVIGNY.

HUGH de Flavigny was born in 1065, and became, in 1077, a monk of St. Vannes, at Verdun, and afterwards abbot of Flavigny, in the twelfth century. He wrote the Chronicle of Verdun, which is extant, and may be found in Labbes Bibl. Manuscript.—*Dupin*.

#### HUGH OF AMIENS.

HUGH of Amiens, also called *Hugh of Rouen*, was born at Amiens, and educated at Laon; afterwards he came to England, where he was made abbot of Roding. In 1130, he became Bishop of Rouen, where he died in 1164. He wrote three books of instruction for his clergy, against the heretics of his day, which have been printed by D'Achery.—*Dupin*.

#### HUGH DE ST. VICTOR.

HUGH de St. Victor was born near Ypres, in Flan-



ders, about 1097. He settled at Paris, where he became prior of St. Victor, and died in 1142. His works were printed at Rouen, in 1648, in 3 vols., folio. The best of these are his Commentaries on Scripture.—*Dupin*.

## HUGH DE ST. CHER.

HUGH de St. Cher, a Roman cardinal, who was so called from the place of his birth, in the vicinity of Vienne, in Dauphine. He became doctor of divinity at Paris, provincial of the Dominican order, and lastly, cardinal. He died in 1268. His principal works are:—  
1. A Collection of various Readings of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuscripts of the Bible, entitled, “*Correctorium Bibliæ*.” 2. A Concordance of the Bible, printed at Cologne, in 1684, 8vo. 3. Commentaries on the Scriptures. 4. *Speculum Ecclesiæ*; Paris, 1480, 4to.—*Dupin*.

## HUMPHREY, LAURENCE.

LAURENCE HUMPHREY was born at Newport Pagnell, in Buckinghamshire, about 1527. He received his school education at Cambridge, after which he became first a demy, and then a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. He took his M.A. degree in 1552; and about the same time he was made Greek reader in his college, and he entered into holy orders. Of his early life, little is known, except that he attached himself to the reforming party, and when in the reign of Mary the Romanizing party in our church had the upper hand, he fell under the displeasure of the heads of houses and rulers of the university. The Bishop of Winchester, (Gardiner) in 1553, visited Magdalen College.

Bishop Gardiner, who was zealous, as a politician, for

the established order of things, would naturally desire to drive from the university such men as Humphrey, and those other fellows of Magdalen who favoured the new learning, and who seemed to him, by their zeal for reform, to endanger the established institutions of the country. But he did not proceed to an act of immediate expulsion against Humphrey. He gave him leave to travel for a year; and when at the end of the year he did not return, he was then expelled.

Humphrey, during the Marian persecution, went into exile, and resided at Zurich, where he unfortunately imbibed anti-church principles. During his exile, he wrote in Latin, a book entitled *Optimates*, being instructions for noblemen in three books. On the death of Mary, he returned to England, and was restored to his fellowship. In 1560, he was made *regius professor* of divinity, and the year after, not without some intrigue on his part, he was elected president of his college. The majority of the fellows appear at this time to have been opposed to reforming principles; nevertheless, Humphrey obtained the place. He was now a married man.

Although thus placed in high station, the opinions of Humphrey were opposed to the principles of the Church. The very foundations were shaken, and it is not surprising that men's minds were perplexed. Men of easier temper and less honest minds, while desiring to carry out the reformation further, found no difficulty in conforming; Humphrey, on the contrary, determined to resist, in the hope of making the Church of England more conformable with the ultra-protestant sects on the continent. He especially contended against the use of those Catholic garments, which, as the mark and badge of a Catholic Church, were wisely retained in the Church of England. They proclaimed to all the world, that although the English were willing to reform the old Catholic Church of their land, yet the Church reformed

was the old Church still. Humphrey desired the introduction of an entirely new religion.

In writing to Henry Bullinger, he expresses himself thus: "Respecting the subject of the habits, I wish you would again write me your opinion, either at length, or briefly, or in one word: first, whether that appears to you as *indifferent* which has been so long established with so much superstition, and both fascinated the minds of the simple with its splendour, and imbued them with an opinion of its religion and sanctity: secondly, whether at the command of the sovereign, (the jurisdiction of the pope having been abolished,) and for the sake of order, and not of ornament, habits of this kind may be worn in church by pious men, lawfully and with a safe conscience. I am speaking of that round cap and popish surplice, which are now enjoined us, not by the unlawful tyranny of the pope, but by the just and legitimate authority of the queen. To the pure, then, can all these things be pure, and matters of indifference. I ask your reverence to let me know, very exactly, what is your opinion."

And again, in 1565, he writes thus:—"I am not ignorant of what you have already written; but you seem to have expressed your sentiments too briefly, and without sufficient perspicuity. Wherefore, I again and again entreat your piety to reply in few words to those little questions of mine; first, whether laws respecting habits may properly be prescribed to church-men, so as to distinguish them from the laity in shape, colour, &c.? Secondly, whether the ceremonial worship of the Levitical priesthood is to be reintroduced into the Church of Christ? Thirdly, whether in respect of habits and external rites, it is allowable to have any thing in common with the papists, and whether Christians may borrow ceremonies from any counterfeit and hostile Church? Fourthly, whether the distinguishing apparel of the priesthood is to be worn [upon all occasions] like



a common dress? Whether this does not savour of monkery, popery, and Judaism? Fifthly, whether those persons who have till now enjoyed their liberty, can with a safe conscience, by the authority of a royal edict, involve in this bondage both themselves and the Church? Sixthly, whether the clerical dress of the papists may be regarded as a matter of indifference? Seventhly, whether the habit is to be worn, rather than the office deserted? I had sent both to master Beza and yourself some other questions; I know not whether you received them. I entreat you to condescend to explain your judgment and opinion a little more fully as soon as possible; and also to touch upon and note the reasons upon which it is founded. You see that it is the Lernaean Hydra, or the tail of popery. You see too what the relics of the Amorites have produced. You see my importunity. Confer, I beseech you, on the whole matter with master Gualter and your colleagues, and write their opinion either to me or master Sampson. Oxford, Feb. 9, 1565, according to the English computation."

His extreme view of this subject may, however, be best seen in a joint letter which he wrote with Dr. Sampson to the same Henry Bullinger. The learning displayed in this letter, and the reference to the fathers, make it interesting; and to those who hold ultra-protestant notions it must be satisfactory. To them, the Catholic habits of our Church must be very disagreeable; and, however much we may regret non-conformity, we must admit that the non-conformists are more consistent than those ultra-protestants, who, arrayed in their surplices, adhere in part to the rubrics of the prayer book.

"As your diligence, most illustrious sir, is proved to us by your writing, so also your incredible love towards us, and especial affection for our Church, and most ardent desire for peace, are all evident from your very courteous letter.

“We sent your reverence some questions, upon which the force, and as it were the hinge, of the whole controversy seemed to turn.

“To these, your reverence has accurately replied; but, if we may be permitted to say so, not entirely to our satisfaction. In the first place, your reverence replies, that such regulations respecting their habits may be prescribed to ministers, as that they may be distinguished both by colour and shape from those of the laity; for that is merely a civil ordinance, and the apostle required the bishop to be *κόσμιος*, orderly. But since this question is brought forward concerning church-men, and relates to *ecclesiastical* polity, we do not see how the peculiar and clerical habit of ministers can be regarded as a mere *civil* matter. We admit, indeed, that a bishop must be *κόσμιος*, but this we refer with Ambrose to the ornaments of the mind, and not the decoration of the person. And as we require in dress both decency, and dignity, and gravity, so we deny that decorum is the object aimed at by the enemies of our religion.

“In the second place, you answer hypothetically, that if a cap, and a habit not unseemly and without superstition, be prescribed to the clergy, Judaism is not on this account brought back. But how can that habit be thought consistent with the simple ministry of Christ, which used to set off the theatrical pomp of the popish priesthood? For not only (as our people wish to persuade your reverence) are the square cap and gown required in public, but the sacred garments are used in divine service; and the surplice, or white dress of the choir, and the cope are re-introduced. Which things not only do the papists declare in their books to be copies and imitations of Judaism, but your reverence has more than once taught the same from Innocent. We most willingly subscribe to the testimony of our most reverend master, Doctor Martyr: but the instances which he produces, tend to decency and order;

these deform the Church, disturb order, overturn all that is decent. The former [instances] are agreeable to the light of nature; the latter are unnatural and monstrous. Those, according to Tertullian's rule, had a shew of necessity and use: these are altogether frivolous, and superfluous, and useless; and neither conducive to edification nor any good end whatever, but more truly, to use the language of the same Peter Martyr, they were splendid accompaniments of that worship which all godly persons now abominate. The papists themselves are boasting that the distinction of ecclesiastical habits now adopted was a popish invention; the constitutions of Otho speak the same thing; the Roman pontifical shows it, and the eyes and lips of all prove it to be the case. The use of churches, stipends, baptism, the creed, &c. was established by divine command long before the pope was born. And, whatever we meet with in any heresy, that is of divine and legitimate authority, we do not deny that, with Augustine, we both approve and retain it. But because this matter is peculiarly one of error and disagreement, we resolutely argue and contend with it.

As to your adding, that the use of the habits was not abolished at the beginning of the reformation, your informants have again stated what is by no means the fact. For in the time of the most serene king Edward the Sixth, the Lord's supper was celebrated in simplicity in many places without the surplice; and the cope, which was then abrogated by law, is now restored by a public ordinance. This is not to extirpate popery, but to replant it; not to advance in religion, but to recede. You say that the priestly garment is a matter of civil concern, and deny that it savours of monachism, popery, or Judaism. What the papists babbled about the surplice, of how great importance the clerical dress is esteemed among them, and to what religion it is dedicated, we doubt not but that your prudence is well acquainted



with from their books. In the next place, this ambitious and pharisaical prescribing of a peculiar dress savours of monkery and popery, and those of the present age ascribe no less virtue to it than the monks of old did to their cowls. Nor in truth has this opinion of holiness and merit burst forth all at once, but has crept on insensibly by little and little. We are therefore hesitating, not without reason, and are endeavouring to check at the outset, what we fear will come to pass in this country. We do not agree with Eustathius, who placed religion in dress; so far from it, that we are at issue with those who superstitiously require peculiar and religious habits as badges of their priesthood. The like also may be said of the canon of the council of Gangra and Laodicea, and of the sixth synod; and to depart from that liberty in which we have hitherto stood, we consider to be giving a kind of sanction to slavery. But neither in this are we too scrupulous; we make no vexatious opposition; we always avoid any bitterness of contention; we are ready to enter into an amicable conference; we do not voluntarily leave [our churches] to the wolves; but constrained and driven from our places, we depart with unwillingness and regret. We leave our brethren and the bishops to stand or fall to their own master; and we look most submissively, but in vain, for the like forbearance towards ourselves. In the rites nothing is discretionary; not that the queen's majesty has been excited to this by us, but she has been influenced by the persuasion of others; so that at length that is established, not which is for the interest of the church, but merely what is not unlawful; and what is not altogether impious, is accounted wholesome, and salutary, and holy, and is confirmed by law.

As ceremonies and sacerdotal habits are signs of religion and marks of profession, they are not of a civil character; and being borrowed from our adversaries, as all allow them to be, they cannot be convenient; and

being marked with the divine anathema, and detested by all godly persons, and had in honour by the wicked and the weak, who think that without them we can neither be ministers, nor that the sacraments can be rightly administered, they neither can nor ought to be reckoned among things indifferent. The ancient fathers had their habits; but they were neither peculiar to bishops, nor distinguished from those of the laity. The instances of St. John and Cyprian are peculiar. Sisinius was a heretic, and is neither to be held out for our commendation nor example. The *pallium* was a dress common to all Christians, as Tertullian relates in his book, and as your reverence has elsewhere remarked. Chrysostom makes mention of a white garment, but only incidentally; he neither commends it nor finds fault with it, and it is not yet ascertained whether it was peculiar to the priests or to the Greeks in general; linen or woollen; white, or merely *clean in appearance*. In the address to the people of Antioch it is certainly opposed both by him and Jerome to a *sordid* [garment,] and in Blondus, there is mention of pallium [cloak] of woollen; so that, in a matter of so much doubt, nothing can be determined.

“That the prescribing habits [to the clergy] is inconsistent with Christian liberty, we have the testimony of Bucer, who was of opinion that the distinction of dress should be entirely done away with, as well on account of the present abuse of it in the English Churches, as for a more decided declaration of our abhorrence of anti-christ, a more full assertion of our Christian liberty, and the removal of dissensions amongst brethren. These words he made use of in his letter to master à Lasco, who was altogether on our side. Whence it is evident, that great offence is occasioned, and edification impeded by it. We must indeed submit *to* the time, but only *for* a time; so that we may always be making progress, and never retreating. Far be it from us either to sow schisms in the Church by a vexatious contest, or by a

hostile opposition to our brethren to do an injury to ourselves: far be it from us, most excellent Bullinger, to charge with impiety things which are in their nature indifferent: far be it from us either to make our own feelings the pretence of abuse, or under the name of conscience to conceal a fondness for dispute. These dogs and this leaven of popery are, believe us, the source of the whole controversy: we desire it to be taken away and buried in eternal oblivion, that no traces of antichristian superstition may remain. The assumption of pre-eminence and pride has always displeased us in the papacy; and can tyranny please us in a free Church? A free synod among Christians hath heretofore untied the knots of controversy: why should every thing be now referred to the pleasure of one or two individuals? Where the liberty of voting and speaking prevails, the truth is vigorous and flourishing.

“You will understand then, reverend father, in a few words, that these things are our principal object,—the authority of the Scriptures,—the simplicity of the ministry of Christ,—the purity of the earliest and best Churches, which, for the sake of brevity, we refrain from mentioning. But on the other side it has not hitherto been our lot either to hear or read of any law or general decree, either of Almighty God, or of any reformed Church, or general council, (which is the rule of Augustine.) We have discovered moreover, that the precedents hitherto adduced are particular ones, and do not confirm the general case.

“Besides, we are of opinion, not that whatever may be in *any* way lawful, should be obtruded, but what in *every* way tends to the edification of the Church should be introduced; and that what may be lawful to some, is not forthwith lawful to all. We have, (praised be God) a doctrine pure and incorrupt: why should we go halting in regard to divine worship, which is not the least important part of religion? Why should we receive



Christ rather maimed, than entire, and pure, and perfect? Why should we look for precedents from our enemies, the papists, and not from you, our brethren of the reformation? We have the same confession in our Churches, the same rule of doctrine and faith; why should there be so great a dissimilarity and discrepancy in rites and ceremonies? The thing signified is the same; why do the signs so differ as to be unlike yours, and to resemble those of the papists? We have the same captain and leader, Christ; why are the banners of the enemy set up in our churches? which, if we were men of God, if we were endued with any zeal, we should long since have abominated and destroyed. We have always thought well of the bishops; we have put a candid interpretation upon their display of grandeur: why cannot they endure us who formerly bore the same cross with them, and who now preach the same Christ, and bear that most delightful yoke together with themselves? Why do they cast us into prison? Why do they persecute us on account of the habits? Why do they spoil us of our property and means of subsistence? Why do they publicly traduce us in their books? Why do they in their published writings, commend a bad cause to posterity? For they have translated into our language some papers of Bucer and of Peter Martyr, and they have now sent forth to the public your private letters to us without our knowledge and consent. So that in pleading their own cause, and vindicating their honour, they neither consult the interests of our Church, nor their brethren, nor your dignity, nor the succeeding generation.

“But, that your reverence may understand that the controversy is of no light or trifling character, but of great importance, and that we are not merely disputing about a cap or a surplice, we send you some straws and chips of the popish religion, from which with your wonted prudence you may imagine the rest, and with

your wonted piety think upon a remedy as soon as possible. And we pray our Lord Jesus Christ to allay these tumults and disorders, to assert His glory, to send forth labourers into His vineyard, that a joyous and abundant harvest may ensue. And we implore you, that by your paternal advice, public writings, and private letters, you will exert yourself, and be active in effecting either the removal of these evils, or the toleration of those good men who are not yet convinced; lest the Roman ceremonial should disunite those whom the firm bond of doctrine hath joined together.

“Give our salutations to Gualter, Simlæ, Lavater, Wolfius, our esteemed masters, with whom if you will confer, you will exceedingly gratify both ourselves and the Church at large. May the Lord Jesus Christ bless His tabernacle and your Zurich!—July, 1566.

“We have written briefly and in haste, and not so much by way of reply, as of admonishing you that there is no end to what might be said on this subject. Do you then, not decide upon what *may* or *can* be done, but upon what *ought* to be done.”

These two learned men having determined to act upon the principles here laid down, were summoned before the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Parker, who, when he had conferred with them, and received a letter of remonstrance from them, peremptorily required of them, either to resign their places, or “to wear the cap appointed by injunction, to wear no hats in their long gowns, to wear a surplice with non-regents’ hoods in the choirs of their colleges, according to the ancient manner there: and to communicate kneeling, in *wafer bread*.” They refused to comply, and the archbishop was perplexed how to proceed, for they had great friends at court, and to their disgrace as religious men, availed themselves of the influence of the profligate Earl of Leicester, who was always a favourer of the Puritans, to obstruct the proceedings of the archbishop. Towards

the end of the year 1564, his grace propounded to them the following nine questions, to each of which they gave succinct answers:—

I. Whether the surplice of the minister or clerk be a thing evil, or wicked, or indifferent?

I. Though the surplice in substance be indifferent, yet by circumstances it is not indifferent; being of the same nature that *vestis peregrina* is in *Zophonie*: the wearers of which God threatened to visit. Which Lyra and Kimhi expound to be the apparel of idolatry, or strange worship. How and by whom they have been so abused, it is not unknown. Therefore *oderis, Christiane, quorum authores non potes non odisse.* Tertull.

II. Whether if it be not indifferent, for what cause?

II. The cause is, for that things that are consecrated to idolatry, are not indifferent. *Nam idolatriæ ab initio dicata habent profanationis suæ maculam.*

III. Whether the Ordinary, detesting of Papistry, may enjoin the surplice to be worn, or may enforce the injunction already made: and whether the minister ought to obey, or no?

III. If an Ordinary, detesting all Papistry, should enjoin the surplice, being a patch of Papistry, it may be said to him in Tertullian's words, *Si tu Diaboli pompam [oderis] quicquid ex ea attigeris, id scias esse idolatriam.* Which if he be persuaded, neither will he enforce the injunction al-



IV. Whether the cope be a thing indifferent, or no; appointed to be worn by order of law, for decency and reverence of the sacrament, and not in respect of any superstition, or holiness?

ready made, neither exact obedience of any minister to it.

IV. Order and laws must have *ἐνταξίαν*. This must not be set from an heresy, or any sect; but from God's word. Reverence unto the Sacrament is wrought by doctrine and discipline. Decency to it is not gained by that which hath been devised and used to deface the Sacrament. Hierom saith, *Aut aurum repudiamus cum cæteris superstitionibus Judæorum, aut si aurum placet, placeant et Judæi, quos cum auro aut probare nobis necesse est, aut damnare.* If the gold ordained by God, for reverence and decency of the Jewish Temple, is not to be admitted to beautify the Church of Christ; much less *cofes* brought in by Papists, the enemies of God, and continued in their service as proper ornaments of their religion, ought to be of us Christians to that end retained.

V. Whether any thing that is indifferent may be enjoined godly to the use of

V. If it be mere indifferent, as the time, place, and such necessary circumstan-

Common Prayer, or Sacraments?

VI. Whether the civil magistrate may constitute, by law, an abstinence from meats, in days prescribed?

VII. Whether a difference may be appointed for external apparel in the ministers of the Church; or any law may be made for the difference of the minister's apparel from the laymen?

VIII. Whether ministers

ces, for which there may be brought a ground out of the Scripture; we think it true.

VI. By cause of abstinence, a manifest commodity riseth to the commonwealth in policy, without superstition, this law may be constituted, *Habita ratione personarum et temporum*.

VII. *Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia expediunt*. As not expedient, Paul pretermitteth it, speaking yet of all things pertaining to the ministry. And whether such prescription to a minister of the New Testament be lawful, may be doubted; sith neither the New Testament decreed, neither the primitive Church appointed any distinction: but would rather ministers to be known from the laity, *doctrina non veste*. Celest. Ambrose, Polydore. Hierom also, as it were uttering the difference of both ministries, saith, *Ille* [Moises] *sacerdotis scientiam ornat in vestibus*. *Iste* [Paulus] *Timotheum et Titum instruit disciplinis, &c.*

VIII. To judge, disprove,

going in such apparel as the papists used, ought to be disproved or condemned of any preacher for so doing?

IX. Whether such preachers ought to be reformed and restrained, or no?

or condemn another man's servant, is not our part: for that he standeth or falleth unto his Lord.

IX. Iren will not have brethren restrained from brotherly communion, for diversity in ceremonies, so there be unity of faith and charity. And it is to be wished, that there may be a charitable permission of diversity, as on both parts there is *unitas operantium*. Bernard. As of meats Hierom teacheth, so of garments we say, *Hæc enim consuetudo in hodiernum usque diem mansit in ecclesiis; et hic quidem abstinentiam amplectitur, ille vero omnibus esculentis absque ullo scrupulo vescitur, et nec hic illum judicat, nec ille alterum reprehendit, sed eos claros et insignes reddit lex concordie.*

To which after was added a tenth, and a conclusion containing a passage of St. Ambrose: which were in these words following.

X. Whether it may stand with a good conscience, for him, who is entered into the ministry, to cease from the same, rather than to wear the apparel by authority in the ministration of

This had no answer.



prayer and sacraments: or to use that extern apparel, which of custom hath been used in the realm ever sithence the Reformation of religion hath been received, and before?

*Quum de ecclesia juberetur exire Ambrosius, ait, Ego, inquit, hoc sponte non faciam, ne lupis ovium septa contradere videar, aut blasphemantibus Deum.*

Tripart. Hist. lib. ix. c. 20.

To these answers were framed long and learned replies, too long to be answered. The two non-conformists were at first placed in confinement, but not in one ordinary prison, and Humphrey then repaired to the house of a private friend in Oxfordshire, or Berks, retaining the presidency of Magdalen College, which was not in the royal gift. The Bishop of Winchester presented him to a benefice in the diocese of Sarum, but Jewell, who then occupied the see, refused to institute him, which led to a controversy between them. But in a short time it seems that though not licensed to preach, his preaching was connived at, and even by the archbishop he was employed in cases where his non-conformity was not likely to incapacitate him. At the archbishop's request he undertook, - in 1571, to write the Life of Bishop Jewell, which shews that the controversy about the living did not lead to any diminution of their mutual regard. But before this, in 1570, he had the office of the deanery of Gloucester, and whether from a desire to obtain that piece of preferment, for of preferment he was appetent, or whether from a fear of having his loyalty impeached, as Lord Burghley suggested might be the case, Laurence

Humphrey had become a conformist. He listened to Cecil's advice; and wore in his latter years, while resident as dean, the very vesture which he had long denounced as an intolerable remnant of exploded superstition. He was installed dean of Gloucester, March 13, 1570, and in 1580, removed to the deanery of Winchester. He died in 1590, leaving a wife, by whom he had twelve children.—*Strype. Annals. Cranmer. Parker. Zurich Letters, by Parker Society. Collier.*

## HUNT, THOMAS.

THOMAS HUNT was born in 1696, and educated at Hart Hall, Oxford, where he took his master's degree, in 1721. He published:—A Fragment of Hippolytus, taken out of two Arabic MSS. in the Bodleian Library, printed in the fourth volume of Bibliotheca Biblica, 1728, 4to. In 1738, he was elected Laudian professor of Arabic, and in the following year he delivered a Latin speech, *De Antiquitate, Elegantia, Utilitate, Linguae Arabicæ, De Usu Dialectorum Orientalium, ac præcipue Arabicæ, in Hebraico Codice interpretando.* In 1746, he issued proposals for printing *Abdollariphi Historiæ Ægypti Compendium*, with a full account of that work, which, however, he never published. The subscribers were recompensed by receiving in lieu of it his posthumous *Observations on the Book of Proverbs*, edited by Dr. Kennicott. In 1747, he was appointed regius professor of Hebrew. He had, in 1740, been elected a fellow of the Royal Society, and was also a fellow of that of Antiquaries. In 1757, he published the works of Bishop Hooper.—*Gent. Mag. Chalmers.*

## HUNTER, HENRY.

HENRY HUNTER was born at Culross, in Perthshire, in

1741. He was educated at Edinburgh, on leaving which university, he became tutor to the sons of Lord Dundonald. In 1766, he was admitted to the Presbyterian ministry, at South Shields; but, in 1771, he removed to London, and became minister of the Presbyterian church at London Wall. He died at the Hot Wells, Bristol, Oct. 27, 1802.

He published :—Sacred Biography, or the Characters of Scripture, 6 vols., 8vo.; Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity; Miscellaneous Sermons, 2 vols., 8vo.; and he translated besides various works from the French, Lavater's Physiognomy; Saurin's Sermons; St. Pierre's Studies of Nature; Letters of Euler to a German Princess, on different subjects in Physics and Philosophy: he also translated Sonnini's Travels.—*Gen. Dict.*

#### HUNTINGTON, ROBERT.

ROBERT HUNTINGTON was born at Deerhurst, in Gloucestershire, in 1636. He was educated first at Bristol, afterwards at Merton College, Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship. In 1670, he went to Aleppo as chaplain to the factory; and during eleven year's residence in the east applied himself to procure MS., and entered for that purpose into an extensive correspondence. He also travelled through Syria, visited Palmyra and Cyprus, and made a voyage to Egypt. In 1682, he returned to his fellowship, and took his doctor's degree; after which he became provost of Trinity College, Dublin, but resigned that place in 1691. At this time he sold his MS. to the curators of the Bodleian library. In 1702, he was consecrated Bishop of Raphoe, in Ireland, but died the same year, and was buried in Trinity College chapel. Some of his papers are in the Philosophical Transactions, and Ray's Collection of Travels; and thirty-



nine of his letters have been published, with his life, by Dr. Thomas Smith.—*Life by Dr. Smith.*

## HURD, RICHARD.

RICHARD HURD was the son of a farmer at Congreve, in the parish of Penkrich, in Staffordshire, and was born there, Jan. 13, 1720. He was educated at the school of Brewood, and next at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his master's degree, and was elected to a fellowship in 1742. In 1749, he took his degree of B.D., and the same year published his Commentary on Horace's Art of Poetry, in which he paid a compliment to Warburton. This laid the foundation of a friendship between these two learned persons, which lasted through life. He had previously, in 1746, published anonymously, Remarks on a late book, entitled an Enquiry into the rejection of Christian Miracles, by the Heathens, by William Wiston, B.D. It should be remarked also that he had the honour of being ordained by Bishop Butler. He was ordained deacon in 1742, and priest in 1744. In May, 1750, he was appointed one of the Whitehall preachers, by Bishop Sherlock. In the following year he published his Commentary on the Epistle to Augustus. In 1756, he accepted as senior fellow of Emanuel, the living of Thurcaston. In 1757, he published, A Letter to Mr. Mason on the Marks of Imitation, and Remarks on Hume's Essay on the Natural History of Religion, in which he is supposed to have been assisted by Warburton: this piece occasioned Hume a great deal of uneasiness. In 1759, he published, without his name:—Dialogues on Sincerity, Retirement, the Golden Age of Elizabeth, and the Constitution of the English Government, 8vo. This was followed by his Letters on Chivalry and Romance, which, with his Dialogues on Foreign Travel, were republished in 1765,

with a preface on the manner of writing dialogue, under the general title of, *Dialogues, Moral and Political*. In the year preceding he had published, *A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Thomas Leland*, in which his late Dissertation on the Principles of Human Eloquence is criticised; and the Bishop of Gloucester's Idea of the Nature and Character of an Inspired Language, as delivered in his lordship's Doctrine of Grace, is vindicated from all the Objections of the learned author of the Dissertation. In 1762, he was promoted by Lord-Chancellor Northington to the rectory of Folkton, in Yorkshire, on the recommendation of Mr. Allen, of Prior Park; in 1765, on the recommendation of Bishop Warburton and Mr. Charles Yorke, he was chosen preacher of Lincoln's Inn; and in August, 1767, he was collated to the Archdeaconry of Gloucester. On Commencement Sunday, July 5, 1768, he was admitted D.D. at Cambridge, and on the same day was appointed to open the lecture founded by his friend Warburton, for the illustration of the prophecies; and his *Twelve Discourses* were published in 1772, under the title of, *An Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies concerning the Christian Church*, and in particular concerning the Church of Papal Rome. In 1769, he published *The Select Works of Mr. Abraham Cowley*, with a preface and notes, in 2 vols., 8vo. In 1775, on the recommendation of Lord Mansfield, he was promoted to the Bishopric of Lichfield and Coventry. In 1776, he published a volume of *Sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn*, which was followed afterwards by a second and third. In June of the same year, he was appointed preceptor to the Prince of Wales, and the Duke of York. In 1781, he was elected a member of the Royal Society of Göttingen. In 1784, he was translated to the see of Worcester.

At Hartlebury Castle, the chief residence of the Bishops of Worcester, he built the library, which he furnished with books which were formerly the property of Bishop

Warburton, to which he made additions. The late Bishop Cornwall, a prelate of much learning, whose tastes were literary, while his theology was sound, took much pride in this library, and handed it down to his successors in good condition. The books have not been much disturbed since Bishop Cornwall's time. It is much to be wished that this library were, under certain regulations, open to the clergy of the whole diocese.

On the death of Archbishop Cornwallis, in 1783, Bishop Hurd was offered by George III. the archiepiscopal see, which he declined. In 1788, he edited, in 7 vols., 4to., a complete edition of the works of Bishop Warburton, but he did not publish the Life of that prelate until 1795. After a few days' confinement to his bed he expired in his sleep, on Saturday morning, May 28, 1808, in the eighty-ninth year of his age. After his death was published, A Collection of Warburton's Letters to himself, which he had directed to be published, for the benefit of the Worcester Infirmary. Of this only 250 copies were printed, to correspond with the 4to edition of Warburton's works, but it has since been reprinted in 8vo. Before his death Hurd had prepared for the press an edition of Addison's works, which was published in 6 vols., 8vo., with philological notes, 1810. In the same year a new edition of the works of Bishop Warburton appeared, according to Dr. Hurd's directions; and, for the first time, an edition of his own works, in 8 vols., 8vo., consisting of his critical works, moral and political dialogues, his sermons, and controversial tracts. —*Minutes of the Life prefixed to his Works.*

#### HURDIS, JAMES.

JAMES HURDIS, an amiable man, was the son of a gentleman of small fortune at Bishopstone, in Sussex, where he was born, in 1763. He was educated at



Chichester School, and in 1780, was entered a commoner of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and at the election of 1782, was chosen a demy of St. Mary Magdalen College, where he won the esteem of Bishop Horne, and in due course was elected fellow. In 1784, he became tutor to the youngest son of the Earl of Chichester, the Honourable George Pelham, afterwards Bishop of Exeter. In 1785, he became curate of Burwash, in Sussex. In 1788, he first appeared before the public as a poet, in his "Village Curate," which was followed by his "Adriano," his "Panthea," "Elmer and Ophelia," and the "Orphan Twins." In 1791, he was presented to the living of Bishopstone, and in 1793, was elected professor of poetry at Oxford, where, in 1794, he took the degree of B.D., and in 1797, that of D.D. He died, December 23, 1801. In addition to the works already mentioned, he published, "A Disquisition on Genesis 1, and 24;" "Select Remarks on the First Ten Chapters of Genesis;" "Sir Thomas More, a Tragedy;" "Cursory Remarks on the Arrangement of the Plays of Shakspeare;" "A Vindication of the University of Oxford from the aspersions of Mr. Gibbon;" "The Favourite Village," a poem, and "Twelve Dissertations on the Nature and Occasions of Prophecy." After his death, his poems were published in three volumes by subscription, with a life by his sister. —*Life by his Sister.*

## HUSS, JOHN.

JOHN HUSS was born in a town of Bohemia, called Hussinen, about the year 1376, and was educated at the University of Prague. Here he took the degree of B.A. in 1393, and of M.A. in 1395. In 1400, he was in holy orders. At no period was there such corruption in the Western Church, as was visible during the present century. A demand for reform was heard in every nation,

and was reiterated by all the most popular preachers. Among these, John Huss soon distinguished himself. And had he confined himself to a general denunciation of the vices of the clergy, he would probably have escaped all censure; but he placed himself at the head of two parties or factions, one in the Church, and the other in the schools, and party violence was directed against him. As a preacher, he was popular; for his asceticism, he was respected; and in his character of confessor to the queen, he was a man of considerable influence. And with these abilities he exerted himself to withdraw the university of Prague from the jurisdiction of Gregory XII., whom the kingdom of Bohemia had hitherto acknowledged as the true and lawful head of the Church. The Archbishop of Prague, and the clergy in general, who were warmly attached to the interests of Gregory, were greatly exasperated at these proceedings. Hence arose a violent quarrel between the incensed prelate and the zealous reformer, which the latter inflamed and augmented, from day to day, by his pathetic exclamations against the court of Rome, and the corruptions that prevailed among the sacerdotal order.

Such were the circumstances that first excited the resentment of the clergy against John Huss. This resentment, however, might have been easily calmed, and perhaps totally extinguished, if new incidents of a more important kind had not arisen to keep up the flame, and increase its fury. In the first place, he adopted the philosophical opinions of the *Realists*, and showed his warm attachment to their cause, in the manner that was usual in that barbarous age, *even by persecuting, to the utmost of his power*, their adversaries the *Nominalists*, whose number was great, and whose influence was considerable in the university of Prague. He also multiplied the number of his enemies in the year 1408, by procuring, through his great credit, a sentence in favour of the Bohemians, who disputed with

the Germans concerning the number of suffrages that their respective nations were entitled to in all matters that were carried by election in the university of Prague. That the nature of this contest may be better understood, it will be proper to observe, that this famous university was divided by its founder, Charles IV., into four nations, to wit, the Bohemians, Bavarians, Poles, and Saxons, of which, according to the original laws of the university, the first had *three suffrages*; and the other three, who were comprehended under the title of the *German nation*, only *one*. This arrangement, however, had not only been altered by custom, but was entirely inverted in favour of the Germans, who were vastly superior to the Bohemians in number, and assumed to themselves the three suffrages, which, according to the original institution of the university, belonged undoubtedly to the latter. Huss, therefore, whether animated by a principle of patriotism, or by an aversion to the *Nominalists*, who were peculiarly favoured by the Germans, raised his voice against this abuse, and employed with success the extraordinary credit he had obtained at court, by his flowing and masculine eloquence, in depriving the Germans of the privilege they had usurped, and in reducing their three suffrages to one. The issue of this long and tedious contest was so offensive to the Germans, that a prodigious number of them, with John Hoffman, the rector of the university at their head, retired from Prague, and repaired to Leipsic, where Frederic surnamed the *Wise*, elector of Saxony, erected for them, in the year 1409, the famous academy which still subsists in a flourishing state. This event contributed greatly to render Huss odious to many, and, by the consequences that followed it, was certainly instrumental in bringing on his ruin. For no sooner had the Germans retired from Prague, than he began, not only to inveigh with greater freedom than he had formerly done against the vices and corruptions of the clergy, but even went so far as



to recommend in an open and public manner, the writings and opinions of the famous Wickliff, whose new doctrines had already made such a noise in England.

He became indeed an enthusiastic admirer of Wickliff, although he seems to have repudiated his heresies. He loved Wickliff because he was a radical reformer, and his admiration of the Englishman gave a pretext to his enemies for predicating of him all the errors which might be deduced from Wickliff's writings.

In 1411, John XXIII. again roused the just indignation of Huss. That pontiff sent forth his emissaries to preach a crusade against Ladislaus, King of Naples, and to grant the usual indulgences. Against the principle of indulgences Huss did not declaim, but against this corrupt application of it, he and his friend, Jerome of Prague, excited the fury of the people, and aroused the indignation of the great body of the nation. The papal emissaries were insulted on several occasions, and interrupted in the midst of their harangues. Three offenders were seized by the senate, and privately executed. This only inflamed the mob still more; they seized the bodies of the malefactors, and carrying them in triumph, buried them in Huss's chapel, the chapel of Bethlehem, with the aromatic offerings usually deposited in the tombs of martyrs.

By these proceedings the wrath of the pope was roused. At a synod, held at Rome, Wickliff's writings were condemned; a mode of proceeding which shews that nothing deemed heretical at Rome could be extracted from the writings of Huss. But Huss was, as he himself admitted, an admirer of Wickliff, and therefore without pausing to enquire how far he supported his heterodoxies, together with his liberal opinions, Huss was excommunicated, and the place where he resided laid under an interdict, in 1413.

Huss was not the man to submit to this with patience. A man more religious would have retired, and have sought

by his writings to lead men gradually to the truth. But he appealed from the pope to Christ Himself,—a mere evasion, or a contemptuous form of defying the authority to which he had hitherto submitted. Had he appealed from the pope to a general council, he would have had many supporters ; or if he had fairly said that he would no longer submit to the papal authority, and would abide the consequences, his conduct would be intelligible. But, how was the decision of our Lord to be known until the day of judgment, when all were ready to admit that every iniquitous judgment upon earth will be reversed.

Huss now retired from Prague to Hussinetz, where he wrote his chief work, the *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, and continually employed himself in preaching in the open air, and in the production of other new works.

In the meantime, in 1414, the council of Constance was opened, the object of which was to remedy the schism of the Church, which had existed for more than twenty years, and to promote a reformation. The Reformation of the Church in its head and members, had, indeed, been long the rallying cry of Europe.

The measures adopted by this council with reference to the schism were wise and energetic. The rival Pontiffs were deposed, or rather the one was deposed, and the other obliged to relinquish his office, and Otho, of the illustrious house of Colonna, was raised to the chair under the name of Martin V. It was also decreed that a general council is superior to the pope. We must at the same time observe, that though this council was attended by 250 bishops, among whom were the Bishops of the Church of England, the council was not œcumenical or general. The Oriental Churches were not represented at all, and have never acknowledged this council, and those bishops only were summoned who were of the obedience of John XXIII., those of Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. not being included. By this council the

writings of Wickliff were condemned, and an iniquitous decree was passed, approving the administration of the eucharist in one kind only; it was admitted that this was contrary to Scripture, and the practice of the primitive Church. As to a reformation nothing was done. Some may have been alarmed at the violence and factious proceedings in Bohemia, and with conservative feelings have feared to improve, lest they should shake to the foundations the fabric of the Church. But perhaps the movement was chiefly opposed by the existence of party feeling. It was to this that John Huss fell a victim. He appeared before the council on the 3rd of November, 1414, furnished with a safe conduct from the emperor. Though he inveighed against the corruptions of the clergy, and urged the necessity of reform, yet this was a topic of discourse in almost every pulpit. As to the eucharist, he believed in transubstantiation; he did not deny the intercession of saints; he admitted the doctrine of indulgences, while he declared against the abuse of them; and he admitted the worshipping of images in the sense now applied to that practice by Anglican defenders of Romish idolatry. And though he contended for giving the cup to the laity, there was no decree of any portion of the Church against this practice until one was passed by this council; he admitted the merit of human works, and received the seven sacraments. Well, then, may Lenfant observe, that as to his heresies it is difficult to know what they were; and that they were only used as a pretext for his condemnation, is clear from the fact that, in the true spirit of modern Romanism, artifices were resorted to that he might be led to utter incautious expressions. He came to the council, moreover, with testimonials of his orthodoxy from all quarters, and even from the papal inquisitor of Bohemia. His journey was a kind of triumph; the radical reformer was every where received with joy by the disaffected.



He came to the council, therefore, in full expectation of being able to accomplish great things. But he found himself surrounded by enemies, exasperated against him by feelings of personal animosity. His austere and religious life was a reproach to those luxurious prelates and heads of monasteries who cared only for the wealth and dignities of the Church; these were prepared to avail themselves of any outcry that might be raised against one who by acts as well as by words, called upon them to reform. Then his declamations against the court of Rome, and the whole system connected therewith, had been, however just, so extremely violent, that all the conservative feeling was enlisted against him, and the conservatives of the day were not very particular as to the measures to be adopted for "silencing and putting down" the object of their dislike. Then again, in the language of Mosheim, it may be observed, that in the council of Constance, there were many men of great influence and weight, who looked upon themselves as personally offended by John Huss, and who demanded his life as the only sacrifice that could satisfy their vengeance. Huss, as has been already mentioned, was not only attached to the party of the Realists, but was peculiarly severe in his opposition to their adversaries. And now he was so unhappy, as to be brought before a tribunal which was principally composed of the Nominalists, with the famous John Gerson at their head, who was the zealous patron of that faction, and the mortal enemy of Huss. Nothing could equal the vindictive pleasure the Nominalists felt from an event that put this unfortunate prisoner in their power, and gave them an opportunity of satisfying their vengeance to the full; and accordingly, in their Letter to Lewis, King of France, they do not pretend to deny that Huss fell a victim to the resentment of their sect, which is also confirmed by the history of the council of Constance. The animosities that always reigned among the Realists and Nominalists,

were at this time carried to the greatest excess imaginable. Upon every occasion that offered, they accused each other of heresy and impiety, and had constantly recourse to corporal punishments to decide the matter. The Nominalists procured the death of Huss, who was a Realist; and the Realists, on the other hand, obtained, in the year 1479, the condemnation of John de Wesalia, who was attached to the party of the Nominalists. These contending sects carried their blind fury so far as to charge each with the sin against the Holy Ghost, and exhibited the most miserable spectacle of inhuman bigotry to the Christian world. The aversion which John Huss, and Jerome his companion, had against the Germans, was a *third* circumstance that contributed to determine their unhappy fate. This aversion they declared publicly at Prague, upon all occasions, both by their words and actions; nor were they at any pains to conceal it even in the council of Constance, where they accused them of presumption and despotism in the strongest terms. The Germans, on the other hand, remembering the affront they had received in the university of Prague, by the means of John Huss, burned with resentment and rage both against him and his unfortunate friend; and as their influence and authority were very great in the council, there is no doubt that they employed them, with the utmost zeal, against these two formidable adversaries. Besides, John Hoffman, the famous rector of the university of Prague, whom Huss had been the occasion of expelling from that city, together with the Germans, and who was in consequence thereof become his most virulent enemy, was consecrated Bishop of Misnia, in the year 1413, and held in this council the most illustrious rank among the delegates of the German Church. This circumstance was also most unfavourable to Huss, and was no doubt, in the event detrimental to his cause.

It is thus that we account for the readiness of Huss to

attend the council, and for the fact that he was condemned for doing little more than had been done continually by others. Nothing could exceed the injustice of the proceedings of the majority of the council with whom the populace at Constance took part. Alas! to what will not party feeling hurry even good men; and how thankful ought we to be that we live in days when party malignity can evaporate in newspapers, instead of bringing its victims to the stake. All agreed now that Huss must be silenced or recant. On the 28th of November, 1414, he was imprisoned, and accused as a heretic. In spite of all the intercessions of his powerful friends in Bohemia, he was treated with increasing severity. *Without giving him an opportunity of defending himself*, he was required unconditionally to retract, but he was not the man to recall what he had deliberately uttered.

At length, on the morning of the 6th of July, 1415, he was brought before the council, then holding its fifteenth session, when sentence to the following effect was passed upon him:—

“That for several years John Huss has seduced and scandalized the people by the dissemination of many doctrines manifestly heretical, and condemned by the Church, especially those of John Wickliff. That he has obstinately trampled upon the keys of the Church and the ecclesiastical censures. That he has appealed to Jesus Christ as sovereign judge, to the contempt of the ordinary judges of the Church; and that such an appeal was injurious, scandalous, and made in derision of ecclesiastical authority. That he has persisted to the last in his errors, and even maintained them in full council. It is therefore ordained that he be publicly deposed and degraded from holy orders, as an obstinate and incorrigible heretic.” . . . . The prelates appointed then proceeded to the office of degradation. He was stripped, one by one, of his sacerdotal vestments; the



holy cup, which had been purposely placed in his hands, was taken from them ; his hair was cut in such a manner as to lose every mark of the priestly character ; and a crown of paper was placed on his head, marked with hideous figures of demons, and that still more frightful superscription, *Heresiarch*."

It will here be seen that general not specific charges were brought against him ; that the chief accusation was this,—he, Huss, admired Wickliff, and Wickliff was condemned as a heretic, therefore Huss must be a heretic, though he may have admired him in some things, not in all. He was now excommunicated, and delivered to the vengeance of the secular arm. The emperor, as "advocate and defender of the Church," commanded his immediate execution. He and the council were duly praised for their decision and firmness by the religious world at the time, with the exception of those who, like Huss himself, determined not only to talk about reform, but to carry out their principles.

The execution of Huss was followed by that of Jerome of Prague, whose life, as being a layman, and not having established any distinct sect, will not be given in this work. Jerome was dealt with even more cruelly, for he retracted, and yet was confined in prison, until withdrawing his recantation, he was executed.

It is to be observed that in both cases the council acted with the approbation of the religious world, with the exception of the Hussite party. The principle was this, that persons whose opinions were supposed to be not strictly conformable to the general opinions of the existing religious world ought to be silenced,—if by fair means, well ; if not, by any means. In the case of John Huss, political feelings must have had their weight, as he had been in his own country a disturber of the public peace.

To justify the emperor the council passed the shameful decree, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. It is

said by some that the council was not bound by the emperor's safe conduct, but surely the emperor was so bound. Instead of being the executioner of the council, he ought to have restored Huss to his country, and then he might have permitted a new trial.—*Lenfant's History of the Council of Constance. Giesler. Mosheim. Palmer's Treatise on the Church. Gilpin's Life of Huss. Waddington.*

## HUTTER, ELIAS.

ELIAS HUTTER was born at Ulm, in 1553, and died at Nuremberg, in 1602. He published an edition of the Hebrew Bible, entitled, *Via Sancta, sive Biblia sacra Hebræa Veteris Testamenti, &c.* in folio, with the following peculiarities; the radical letters are all printed in black, the servile in hollow types, and the quiescent in smaller characters above the line. At the end, the cxvii<sup>th</sup> Psalm is given in thirty languages. He also published two Polyglott Bibles, one at Hamburg, in 1596, in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German, in 3 vols., fol.; and the other at Nuremberg, in 1590, with the addition of the Italian, French, Sclavonic, and Saxon versions, also in fol. In 1600, he published a Polyglott of the New Testament, in twelve languages, viz.:—the Syriac, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, Bohemian, Italian, Spanish, French, English, Danish, and Polish; which, in an edition printed in 1603, were reduced to to the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German.—*Moreri.*

## HUTTER, LEONARD.

LEONARD HUTTER, a native of Ulm, was born in 1563. He studied at Strasburg, and lastly at Wirtemberg, where he became professor of divinity, and died in 1616.

He was a rigid Lutheran, equally opposed to Geneva and Rome. He wrote:—*Compendium Theologiæ, cum Notis D. Gotofriedi Cundisii*; *Loci Communes Theologici*: *Lectiones Evangeliorum et Epistolarum anniversariæ*, Ebraicè, Græcè, Latinè, Germanicè, harmonicè, et symmetricè; *Explicatio Epistolæ D. Pauli ad Galatas*; *Formulæ Concionandi*; *Explicatio Libri Concordiæ Christianæ*; *Meditatio Crucis Christi, sive Homiliæ in Historiam Passionis et Mortis Christi*; *Epitome Biblica*; and a number of Disputations, Orations, and controversial treatises, in the Latin and German languages.—*Gen. Dict. Freheri Theatrum. Saxii Onomast.*

## HUYGHENS, GOMARUS.

GOMARUS HUYGHENS was born in 1631, at Liere, or Lyre, in Brabant. He professed philosophy at Louvain, and in 1677 was made president of the college of Pope Adrian VI., where he died in 1702, leaving several works in Latin; the principal are:—*The Method of remitting and retaining Sins*; *Theses on Grace*; *Theological Conferences*; and a *Course of Divinity*, 15 vols., 12mo., &c. He refused to write against the four articles of the French clergy, which displeased the court of Rome and the Jesuits. Huyghens was the intimate friend of Quesnel, and zealously defended him.—*Moreri.*

## HYDE, THOMAS.

THOMAS HYDE was born in 1636, at Billingsley, in Shropshire, of which parish his father was minister. He was admitted of King's College, Cambridge, in 1652; but about a year afterwards, though not seventeen, he was taken to be assistant to Walton, in his *Polyglott*.



In 1658 he entered at Queen's College, Oxford, and the year after, by the direction of Richard Cromwell, chancellor of the university, he was admitted M.A. Soon after the Restoration he was elected under-librarian, (upon the ejection of Mr. Henry Stubbe,) and then head-librarian to the Bodleian; and in 1665, he published a Latin translation of the Observations of Uleigh Beig, or as he is commonly called, Tamerlane, on the Longitude and Latitude of the Stars. In October, 1666, he was made prebendary of Sarum, in 1678, Archdeacon of Gloucester, in 1682, he took the degree of D.D., and in 1691, he was elected Laudian professor of Arabic, on Dr. Pocock's death. In 1697, he was made regius professor of Hebrew, and canon of Christ Church; and in 1701, he resigned the librarianship of the Bodleian. He died in 1703. He has the reputation of being one of the best Orientalists this country ever produced. The best known of his works is, *Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum, eorumque Magorum, &c.*, published in 1700, 4to., which abounds in many interesting and curious particulars concerning the theology, history, and learning, of Eastern nations. In addition to Hebrew, Syriac, Persian, Arabic, &c. Hyde was also acquainted with the Malay and Armenian languages; and he was one of the first Europeans who acquired a knowledge of Chinese. Besides the works already mentioned, he published, *Quator Evangelia et Acta Apostolorum Linguâ Malaicâ, Characteribus Europæis*, Oxford, 1677, 4to. His *Epistola de Mensuris et Ponderibus Serum sive Sinensium, &c.* was printed at the end of Dr. Edward Bernard's book, entitled, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus antiquis Libri tres*. In 1767, Dr. Gregory Sharpe, master of the temple, collected and republished some of Dr. Hyde's pieces that were formerly published, under the title of, *Syntagma Dissertationum et Opuscula*, 2 vols., 4to. This is accompanied by a life of the author.

*Sharpe.*

## IBBETSON, JAMES.

JAMES IBBETSON was born in 1717, and educated at Exeter College, Oxford. He became rector of Bushey, in Hertfordshire, and Archdeacon of St. Albans, and died in 1781. He wrote:—*Epistola ad Phil-Hebræos Oxonienses*; *A Short History of the General Convocation of the Province of Canterbury*; and several single sermons, charges, and tracts.—*Gen. Dict.*

## IBBOT, BENJAMIN.

BENJAMIN IBBOT was born in 1680, at Beachamwell, in the county of Norfolk, where his father was rector, and educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, whence he removed to Corpus Christi, in 1700, and was made a scholar of that house. He commenced M.A. in 1703, and was elected into a Norfolk fellowship in 1706, but resigned it in the following year, on being appointed librarian to Archbishop Tenison, who soon after nominated him his chaplain, and in 1708, collated him to the treasurership of the cathedral of Wells, and presented him to the rectory of the united parishes of St. Vedast, Foster Lane, and St. Michael le Querne, in London. George I. appointed him one of his chaplains in ordinary, in 1716; and when his majesty visited Cambridge, in October, 1717, Ibbot was by royal mandate created D.D. In 1713, and 1714, by the appointment of the archbishop, he preached the Boyle Lectures, in which he ably confuted the objections of Collins. Some time after, he was appointed assistant-preacher to Dr. Samuel Clarke, and rector of St. Paul's, Shadwell; and in 1724, he was made a prebendary of Westminster. He died in 1725, in the forty-fifth year of his age, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. His Boyle Lectures were pub-

lished in 1727, 8vo.; and Thirty Discourses on Practical Subjects were selected from his MSS. by Dr. Clarke, and published for the benefit of his widow, 2 vols., 8vo. In 1719, Ibbot published a translation of Puffendorff's treatise, *De Habitu Religionis Christianæ ad Vitam civilem*. Some verses of his are in Dodsley's Collection. —*Life by Flexman.*

#### IGNATIUS, SAINT.

SAINT IGNATIUS, surnamed Theophorus, was born in the first century. The word Theophorus may signify either one who is carried by God, or else one who carries God in his breast. By some writers it is thought that St. Ignatius was so designated, because he was the child whom our blessed Saviour took in his arms and set before his disciples, as a pattern of humility,—he was thus borne or carried by God, since our blessed Lord is both God and Man. This account is certainly ancient, but its authenticity is denied by Bishop Pearson, and Archbishop Wake. But whether this is a fact or not, it is certain, as St. Chrysostom tells us, that he was intimately acquainted with the holy apostles, and that upon the death of Euodius, the first Bishop of Antioch, the metropolis of Syria, he was chosen as his successor by the apostles, and from them received imposition of hands. The reader will see the character which in this high office he sustained, as given him by his contemporaries; for as the contemporary account of his martyrdom is not very long, and as a peculiar interest attaches to what was written by the eye-witnesses of his sufferings, that account is here given in an abbreviated translation from the original Greek, published by Dr. Grabe:—

“Trajan, in the nineteenth year of his reign, being elated with his victory over the Scythians and Dacians,



and many other nations ; and thinking that the religious company of Christians was yet wanting to his absolute and universal dominion : threatened them that they should be persecuted, unless they would choose to worship the devil, with all other nations. Wherefore our brave soldier of Christ, being in fear for the Church of Antioch, was voluntarily brought before Trajan ; who was at that time there, on his way to Armenia, and the Parthians, against whom he was hastening.

“ Being come into the presence of the Emperor Trajan, the emperor asked him, saying ; ‘ What a wicked wretch art thou, thus to endeavour to transgress our commands, and to persuade others also to do likewise, to their destruction ? ’ Ignatius answered ; ‘ No one ought to call Theophorus after such a manner ; forasmuch as all wicked spirits are departed far from the servants of God. But if, because I am a trouble to those evil spirits, you call me wicked, with reference to them I confess the charge ; for having [within me] Christ, the heavenly king, I dissolve all the snares of the devils.’

“ *Trajan* replied, ‘ And who is Theophorus ? ’ *Ignatius*. ‘ He who has Christ in his breast.’ *Trajan*. ‘ And do not we then seem to thee to have the gods within us, who fight for us against our enemies ? ’ *Ignatius*. ‘ You err, in that you call the evil spirits of the heathens gods, For there is but one God, Who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that are in them ; and one Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, Whose kingdom may I enjoy.’ *Trajan*. ‘ His kingdom you say, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate.’ *Ignatius*. ‘ His Who crucified my sin, with the inventor of it ; and has put all the deceit and malice of the devil under the feet of those who carry Him in their heart.’ *Trajan*. ‘ Dost thou then carry Him Who was crucified within thee ? ’ *Ignatius*. ‘ I do : for it is written, I will dwell in them and walk in them.’ Then Trajan pronounced this sentence against him : ‘ Forasmuch as Ignatius has confessed

that he carries about within himself Him that was crucified, we command that he be carried, bound by soldiers, to the great Rome, there to be thrown to the beasts, for the entertainment of the people.'

"When Ignatius heard this sentence, he cried out with joy, 'I thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou hast vouchsafed to honour me with a perfect love towards Thee; and hast made me to be put into iron bonds with Thy apostle Paul.' Having said this, he with joy put his bonds about him; and having first prayed for the Church, and commended it with tears unto the Lord, he was hurried away, like a choice ram, the leader of a good flock, by the brutish soldiers, in order to his being carried to Rome, there to be devoured by the blood-thirsty beasts.

"Wherefore with much readiness and joy, out of his desire to suffer, he left Antioch and came to Seleucia; from whence he was to sail. And after a great deal of toil, being come to Smyrna, he left the ship with great gladness, and hastened to see Polycarp, his fellow-scholar, who was bishop there: for they had both of them been formerly the disciples of St. John.

"Being brought to him he entreated, first of all, the whole Church, (for the churches and cities of Asia attended him by their bishops, and priests, and deacons,) but more particularly Polycarp, to pray to God in his behalf; that being suddenly taken by the beasts from the world, he might appear before the face of Christ.

"Setting sail from Smyrna he came to Troas; from whence, being brought to Neapolis, he passed by Philippi through Macedonia, and that part of Epirus which is next to Epidamnus: having found a ship in one of the sea-ports, he sailed over the Adriatic sea: and from thence entering into the Tyrrhene, and passing by several islands and cities, at length he saw Puteoli; which being shewed to him, he hastened to go forth, being desirous to walk from thence, in the way that

Paul the apostle had gone: but a violent wind arising and driving on the ship, would not suffer him so to do; wherefore, commending the love of the brethren in that place, he sailed forward.

“And the wind continuing favourable to us, in one day and a night, we indeed were unwillingly hurried on, as sorrowing to think of being separated from this blessed martyr: but to him it happened just according to his wish, that he might go the sooner out of the world, and attain unto the Lord, whom he loved. Wherefore, sailing into the Roman port, and those impure sports being almost at an end, the soldiers began to be offended at our slowness; but the bishop with great joy complied with their hastiness.

“Being soon forced away from the port we forthwith met the brethren, (for the report of what concerned Ignatius was spread abroad,) who were full of fear and joy: they rejoiced in that God had vouchsafed them the company of Theophorus, but were afraid, when they considered, that such an one was brought thither to die. He desired them that they would shew a true love to him; persuading them not to envy him who was hastening unto the Lord. And so, all the brethren kneeling down, he prayed to the Son of God in behalf of the Churches, that He would put a stop to the persecution, and continue the love of the brethren towards each other; which being done, he was with all haste led into the amphitheatre, and speedily, according to the command of Cæsar before given, thrown in, the end of the spectacles being at hand. It was then a very solemn day, called in the Roman tongue the thirteenth of the calends of January; upon which the people were more than ordinarily wont to be gathered together. Thus was he delivered to the cruel beasts, near the temple, by wicked men; that so the desire of the blessed martyr, Ignatius, might be accomplished; as it is written, *‘The desire of the righteous is acceptable;’*



namely, that he might not be burthensome to any of the brethren, by the gathering of his relics, but might be wholly devoured by them; according as in his epistle he had before wished that so his end might be. For only the greater and harder of his bones remained; which were carried to Antioch, and there preserved."

His martyrdom occurred, according to some, in the year 107, according to others, in 116. His epistles, few in number, are among the most important relics of antiquity. No one could have written them except one who held those fundamental verities of the Christian religion which are still held by us, some of which, as those relating to the divinity of our Lord Christ, His actual passion as truly Man, together with justification by faith, he incidentally has occasion to assert. But his epistles are practical rather than doctrinal, and as in practice most evils have resulted to the church from insubordination, he is very urgent upon the duty of submission to the bishop set over us by God, and abundant proof is given in his works, that the government of the Church was in the apostolic age essentially the same as it is now, under bishops, priests, and deacons.

At Smyrna, says Mr. Collinson, to whose Bampton Lectures we are indebted for the following analysis, he wrote four epistles, and three more afterwards at Troas, chiefly addressed to the Churches of Asia Minor. This is his exordium to the mother Church: "Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the worthily happy Church in Ephesus of Asia, blessed in the majesty and fulness of God the Father, predestinated before the world to be perpetually permanent in glory, immovable, united and elect in the genuine suffering for the truth, by the will of the Father, and of Jesus Christ our God, much joy in Jesus Christ, and in His spotless grace." The author begins with thanking the Ephesians for sending to him their Bishop Onesimus, whose character in Christian charity he deems inexpressible, and other ministers,

and exhorts them to unity and subjection to their bishop and presbytery. His own humility is at the same time conspicuous: "I do not," says he, "dictate to you, as if I were a person of any consequence: for though I am bound for His name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus. But now I begin to learn, and I speak to you as my fellow-disciples." He continues his advice to them of submission to their ecclesiastical superiors: "Let no man deceive himself; if a man be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God. If the prayer of one or two has so much strength, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole Church? He who separates from it, is proud and condemns himself: for it is written, God resisteth the proud. Let us study therefore obedience to the bishop, that we may be subject to God. And the more silent and gentle any one observes his bishop to be, the more on that account should he reverence him. Every one to whom the Master commits the stewardship, should be received as the Master himself." He exhorts them to shun false teachers, to pray without ceasing for other men: for there is hope of repentance in them that they may attain unto God, and finally to live in unity, in faith and in charity, and to shew the truth of their profession by their works.

Ignatius continually expresses his eager and longing desire of martyrdom, and repeats the most earnest injunctions to ecclesiastical subordination. All his epistles turn upon the same topics, and contain detached didactic sentences, expressed certainly in a tumid Asiatic style, but full of true Christian devotion, illustrated in the purest precepts. In the present age, in which no bounds seem to be set to claims of liberty of conscience, it is deserving of the most serious consideration among Christians, that the chief topic insisted upon by the two apostolical fathers, Clement and Ignatius, is Church union; and the great object of their writings is to dis-

suade men from separating, for slight pretences, from their lawful pastors. We do not endeavour to persuade any to act so as to do violence to their consciences ; but we wish to shew that it is the will of God that private opinion should on many occasions give way ; and that individuals, instead of arrogating a continual right of choosing and judging for themselves, should consider that without some submission, there can, in great societies, be no union and concord, which are most acceptable in God's sight.

“Without the bishops and presbyters,” says Ignatius, “there is no Church. He that is within the altar is pure ; but he that is without, that is, who does any thing without the bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, is not pure in his conscience.”

Throughout these epistles are scattered cautions against the Docetæ, who taught that Jesus Christ was a phantom, and suffered only in appearance. Ignatius asserts the real humanity and divinity of our Redeemer. “There is one Physician, both of the flesh and of the spirit, made and not made. God incarnate, true life in death, both of Mary and of God ; even Jesus Christ our Lord.” His testimony is not wanting concerning the evidences of the Holy Ghost ; for after exhorting the Ephesians to public devotion, to unity and peace, he adds : “Of all which nothing is hid from you, if ye have perfect faith and charity in Jesus Christ, which are the beginning and end of life. For the beginning is faith, and the end charity. The union of these two is of God ; and from them flow all things that constitute the beauty of holiness. Faith sins not ; charity hates not. As the tree is known by its fruits, so they who profess and call themselves Christians, are known by their actions.” Were there any other sure criterion of divine inspiration, it might be expected that a person under the circumstances in which Ignatius was placed, and possessing as he did a temper of lively sensibility,



should express strong feelings of immediate spiritual influence: but he is free from all weaknesses of this kind; and instead of a confident persuasion of his being elected, or accepted to salvation, humility fills his mind. "I understand," he says, "many things in God, but I refrain myself lest I should perish in my boasting. For now I ought the more to fear—desiring, as I do, to suffer, but doubting my own unworthiness."

Of the same tenor is this exhortation to his friend Polycarp, who had been a fellow-disciple with him, under the apostle John, and who was then Bishop of Smyrna. "Be wise as a serpent, but harmless as a dove. The times demand thee as a pilot is wanted in a storm, and thy prayers will be like a haven to a tempest-tossed ship. Be sober-minded as the soldier of God: the crown proposed to thee is eternal life. Stand firm and immoveable, as an anvil, when it is beaten upon. It is the part of a brave combatant, after wounds, to conquer. But especially we ought to endure all things for God's sake, that He may bear with us. Improve in diligence daily: consider the times; and expect Him, Who is above all time, eternal, invisible, though for our sakes He became visible; impalpable, and impassible, yet for us subjected to sufferings, enduring all things for our salvation."

There are some spurious writings attributed to Ignatius, which are accurately examined by Dupin and others. Of the genuine Epistles the best editions are, that of Isaac Vossius, Amsterdam, 1640, 4to; that of Usher, London, 1647, 4to; that of Cotelier, in his *Patres Apostolici*, Greek and Latin, Paris, 1672, fol.; and those of Oxford, 1708, 8vo, and 1709, 4to, the former by Aldrich, the latter by Pearson and Smith.—*Works. Cave. Dupin. Wake. Collinson.*

## IGNATIUS LOYOLA.

IGNATIUS LOYOLA. (*See his life under the name of Loyola.*)

ILLYRICUS, MATTHIAS FLACIUS, OR FRANCOWITZ.

MATTHIAS FLACIUS OR FRANCOWITZ ILLYRICUS, Lat. *Flacius Illyricus*, was born in 1520 at Albona, in Istria, and was instructed in grammar and the classics by Egnatius at Venice. Not being able, however, to meet the expenses of a university education, he intended to enter a monastery; but happening to confer with a relation of his mother, who was provincial of the Cordeliers, and who had begun to see through the errors of Popery, he was induced to go to Basle in 1539, whence, after a few months' stay, he went to Tübingen, where he remained until 1541, and then removed to Wittemberg, to complete his studies under Luther and Melancthon, the latter of whom found him some employment in the university, and was the means of relieving his mind from anxious doubts respecting some of the fundamental principles of the Reformed religion. He was thus employed when all the schools of Saxony were dispersed by the war, on which he went to Brunswick, where he acquired great reputation by his lectures. In 1547, he returned to his former employment at Wittemberg, and here first began his differences with his brethren on the subject of the Interim, which he opposed with great vehemence.

The rise of these unhappy divisions, says Mosheim, must be dated from the year 1548, when Charles V. attempted to impose upon the Germans the famous edict, called the *Interim*. Maurice, the new elector of Saxony, desirous to know how far such an edict ought to be respected in his dominions, assembled the doctors of Wittemberg and Leipsic in the last mentioned city, and proposed this nice and critical subject to their serious examination. Upon this occasion Melancthon, complying with the suggestions of that lenity and moderation that were the great and leading principles in the

whole course of his conduct and actions, declared it as his opinion, that, in matters of an *indifferent* nature, compliance was due to the imperial edicts. But in the class of matters indifferent, this great man and his associates placed many things which had appeared of the highest importance to Luther, and could not, of consequence, be considered as indifferent by his true disciples. For he regarded as such, the doctrine of *justification by faith alone*; the *necessity of good works to eternal salvation*; the *number of the sacraments*; the *jurisdiction* claimed by the *pope and the bishops*; *extreme unction*; the observation of certain religious festivals, and several superstitious rites and ceremonies. Hence arose that violent scene of contention and discord, that was commonly called the *Adiaphoristic* controversy, which divided the Church during many years, and proved highly detrimental to the progress of the Reformation. The defenders of the primitive doctrines of Lutheranism, with Flacius at their head, attacked with incredible bitterness and fury the doctors of Wittemberg and Leipsic, and particularly Melancthon, by whose counsel and influence every thing relating to the *Interim* had been conducted, and accused them of apostacy from the true religion. Melancthon, on the other hand, seconded by the zeal of his friends and disciples, justified his conduct with the utmost spirit and vigour. In this unlucky debate the two following questions were principally discussed: First, “whether the matters that seemed indifferent to Melancthon were so in reality?” This his adversaries obstinately denied. Secondly, “whether in things of an indifferent nature, and in which the interests of religion are not especially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth.

This debate concerning things indifferent became, as might well have been expected, a fruitful source of other controversies, which were equally detrimental to



the tranquillity of the Church, and to the cause of the Reformation.

Flacius retired in 1549 to Magdeburg, where he published several books, and began that ecclesiastical history which is called the Centuries of Magdeburg, of which he had the chief direction. Of this work the first four centuries, and part of the fifth, were composed at Magdeburg; the fifth was finished at Jena; the sixth was written in the place to which the authors had retired on account of the persecution of their two coadjutors, Gallus and Faber; the seventh was composed in the country of Mecklenburgh, and the remainder in the city of Wismar, in the same country. The best edition of this work is that of Basle, 1624, 3 vols, fol. In 1557, Flacius was made Hebrew and divinity professor in the new university of Jena. The consequences of this nomination, says Mosheim, with the feelings of a Lutheran, were most deplorable. For this turbulent and impetuous man, whom nature had formed with an uncommon propensity to foment divisions and propagate discord, did not only revive all the ancient controversies that had distracted the Church, but also excited new debates; and sowed, with such avidity and success, the seeds of contention between the divines of Weimar and those of the electorate of Saxony, that a fatal schism in the Lutheran Church was apprehended by many of its wisest members. And, indeed, this schism would have been inevitable if the machinations and intrigues of Flacius had produced the desired effect. For, in the year 1559, he persuaded the Dukes of Saxe-Weimar to order a *refutation* of the errors that had crept into the Lutheran Church, and particularly of those that were imputed to the followers of Melancthon, to be drawn up with care, to be promulgated by authority, and to be placed among the other religious edicts and articles of faith that were in force in their dominions. But this pernicious design of dividing the Church proved abortive;

for the other Lutheran princes, who acted from the true and genuine principles of the Reformation, disapproved of this seditious book from a just apprehension of its tendency to increase the present troubles, and to augment, instead of diminishing, the calamities of the Church.

This theological incendiary kindled the flame of discord and persecution even in the Church of Saxe-Weimar, and in the university of Jena, to which he belonged, by venting his fury against Strigelius, the friend and disciple of Melancthon. This moderate divine adopted, in many things, the sentiments of his master, and maintained, particularly, in his public lectures, that the *human will*, when under the influence of the *divine grace* leading it to repentance, was not totally *unactive*, but bore a certain part in the salutary work of its conversion. In consequence of this doctrine, he was accused by Flacius of *Synergism*, at the court of Saxe-Weimar; and by order of the prince was cast into prison, where he was treated with severity and rigour.

He held with Strigelius a public disputation at Weimar, in 1560, concerning the natural powers and faculties of the human mind, and their influence in the conversion and conduct of the true Christian. In this conference the latter seemed to attribute to unassisted nature too much, and the former too little. The one looked upon the fall of man as an event that extinguished in the human mind, every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing behind it but universal darkness and corruption. The other maintained, that this degradation of the powers of nature was by no means universal or entire; that the will retained still some propensity to worthy pursuits, and a certain degree of activity that rendered it capable of attainments in virtue. Strigelius, who was well acquainted with the wiles of a captious philosophy, proposed to defeat his adversary by puzzling him, and addressed to him with that view, the following question :

“Whether original sin, or the corrupt habit which the human soul contracted by the fall, is to be placed in the class of *substances* or *accidents*?” Flacius answered with unparalleled imprudence and temerity, that it belonged to the former; and maintained to his dying hour this most extravagant and dangerous proposition, that *original sin is the very substance of human nature*. Nay, so invincible was the obstinacy with which he persevered in this strange doctrine, that he chose to renounce all worldly honours and advantages rather than depart from it. It was condemned by the greatest and soundest part of the Lutheran Church, as a doctrine that bore no small affinity to that of the Manichæans. But, on the other hand, the merit, erudition, and credit of Flacius procured him many respectable patrons and able defenders among the most learned doctors of the Lutheran Church, who embraced his sentiments, and maintained his cause with the greatest spirit and zeal; of whom the most eminent were Cyriac Spangenberg, Christopher Irenæus, and Cælestine.

This dispute was held before the Duke of Saxony, and was carried on to thirteen meetings, the acts of which were published, with a preface by Musæus, one of Flacius’s followers. So unpalatable did the extreme and heretical views of Flacius become, that he was obliged to retire successively to Ratisbon, Antwerp, Strasburg, and finally to Frankfort, where he died in 1575. His works are numerous; the principal are, his *Clavis Scripturæ*, 2 vols. fol., of which there have been seven editions, the last at Leipsic in 1695; *Catalogus testium Veritatis*; an edition of the *Ancient Latin Mass*, (this is now very scarce;) *Appendix to the Latin Mass*; and *Varia ductorum piorumque Virorum de Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu Poemata*.—*Mosheim. Melchior Adam. Bayle.*

INGRAM, ROBERT.

ROBERT INGRAM was born at Beverley, in Yorkshire,



March 9, 1726-7. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship, and took his degrees in arts. His first preferment was the perpetual curacy of Bridhurst, in Kent, next the living of Orston in Nottinghamshire, and afterwards the vicarages of Wormington, and Boxted, in Essex. He died in 1804. Mr. Ingram wrote:—1. A View of the Great Events of the Seventh Plague, or Period when the Mystery of God shall be finished. 2. Accounts of the Ten Tribes of Israel being in America, originally published by Manasseh Ben Israel. 3. A Complete and Uniform Explanation of the Prophecy of the Seven Vials of Wrath.—*Gent. Mag.*

## INGULPHUS.

INGULPHUS was born in London, about the year 1030, and was educated probably at Westminster and Oxford. In 1076, he became Abbot of Croyland, in Lincolnshire. He died in 1109. He wrote a work on the Life of St. Guthlac, and a History of the Monastery of Croyland. These are satisfactorily proved, in the Quarterly Review for June, 1826, to be pure works of fiction, in an able article attributed to a writer, whose profound acquaintance with all the details of English History renders his dictum authoritative,—Sir Francis Palgrave.—*Pitts. Quarterly Review.*

## IRENÆUS, SAINT.

ST. IRENÆUS was undoubtedly by birth a Greek, and was probably born at or near Smyrna, but in what year is a matter of dispute. Dupin and Massuet place his birth in A. D. 140, Tillemont twenty years earlier, and Dodwell is desirous of carrying it up ten or twenty years earlier

still. But, whatever the precise date, it is certain, from his own words, that he knew St. Polycarp, and was old enough in that martyr's life to mark his mode of living, and his discourse: he tells us that he remembered "his account of his familiar intercourse with the apostle John, and the survivors of those who had seen the Lord, and his rehearsals of their sayings, and their accounts of the discourses and miracles of our Lord." Upon the death of St. Polycarp, he probably put himself under the guidance of Papias, whom St. Jerome calls his disciple. He certainly quotes that pious but too credulous writer himself several times. He mentions his acquaintance with another contemporary of the apostolical generation, from whom he learnt much, but he does not name him.

How long he remained in Asia Minor is unknown; the next account of him is at Lyons, as a priest under Pothinus, the bishop of that place; and he had abode at Lyons, in 177, so long as to have gained the character of a *person zealous for the gospel of Christ*, in the epistle of the martyrs to Eleutherus. He was sent by the martyrs to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, with their testimony against the Montanists. On the mission of Irenæus to Rome, Dr. Beaven makes the following very sensible remarks:—"This appears to have been the third application made to Rome from any distant Church; the first being from Corinth, under St. Clement, the second by Polycarp, to Anicetus. The first was not unnatural, when we consider that Clement had been the companion of St. Paul, and that the Church of Corinth was under pecuniary obligations to that of Rome. The second was a consultation, as between equals. The third was a deputation from the Churches of an adjacent country, (civilly subject to Rome, and therefore in the habit of visiting the city,) to expostulate with the then bishop upon an injudicious step he had taken. They were evidently led to it by their sympathy with the Asiatic

Churches, from whence they drew their own origin, whose divisions and errors they deplored : and they were afraid of the mischief likely to accrue to the Christian world from the sanction given to the Montanist errors by the head of a Church so important as that of Rome, to which, from its being the common resort of Christians from all quarters, they had been in the habit of looking as the depository of their common traditions, and whose example therefore must be tenfold more hurtful than that of any other Church, if given on the side of error. It was, moreover, in all probability, an expostulation with him for having committed the actual error of countenancing what the whole Catholic Church from first to last, has declared to be delusion and heresy ; and the object of it was, to entreat him to recant his error. How contrary is this whole matter to the notion of these Churches being subject to that of Rome, or to their looking up to the bishop of it as an authorised director in cases of doubt and difficulty ! And even if we do not admit that Eleutherus was the actual bishop who gave his letters of peace to the Montanists, yet it has always been acknowledged that the letters of the martyrs, thus sent by the public authority of the Gaulish Churches, were intended to caution him against entertaining them and that either he or Victor did countenance them. And how inconsistent is such a state of things with the idea of a Church privileged to be free from error or delusion, watching over others, instead of being watched over by them !”

In the persecution which raged at Lyons, Pothinus died at the age of ninety, in fact a martyr. The venerable old bishop, suffering under sickness, as well as the weakness incident to age, was dragged to the tribunal, then back again to prison, beaten, kicked, assailed with every missile that came to hand, and in two days died in prison. Irenæus succeeded him in the episcopate, and it appears from Eusebius that the Bishop of Lyons was



primate of Gaul, or at all events had influence over several dioceses.

By his learning and zeal he soon came to be regarded as "the light of the Western Church;" and he is said to have cultivated and enlightened the Celtic nations. By his letters to Blastus and Florinus he gave proof of his zeal against schism and heresy. Florinus was a man of eminence, but in opposing Marcion, who had taught two first principles, the one of good, the other of evil, he fell into the peculiarity of asserting that God was the author of evil. From this position he was driven by Irenæus, but he fell again into error through the Valentinian speculations. Irenæus again wrote to him a treatise which, though less, was perhaps the germ of his great work against Gnosticism. Of the Gnostic theories the general principle of all was to escape making God the author of evil, by making it to spring, by a species of chance, from some emanation indefinitely removed from the great First Cause. For this purpose, they imagined certain spiritual beings, more or less numerous, the first pair produced by the Supreme Being, in conjunction with an emanation from himself; the rest emanating, for the most part, successively from each preceding pair, and becoming more and more liable to infirmity as they were further distant from the One Original. From one of the most distant they imagined the author of evil to have sprung, whom they also made the creator of the world, and the god of the Jews. They professed to believe in Jesus, but regarded Him either as not truly man or as not truly united with the Godhead; and Christ, as well as the Only-begotten, the Saviour, and the Life, they looked on as distinct from Him.

The great charm of these theories was, that they professed to unravel a great secret, which no previous philosophy had reached, and which Christianity itself had left untouched. We may wonder, indeed, that any Christian should have found anything to tempt him in

hypotheses so subtile and intricate, and so palpably at variance with the known truths of the Gospel. But we must bear in mind that when they first arose, no part of the New-Testament Scripture was written; that consequently the poison had time to mix itself with the current of opinion everywhere, before an antidote of general application was provided; that the minds of all inquiring men in those times were peculiarly given to subtilties, and to the notion of inventing schemes selected from all prevailing opinions; and that, to recommend themselves to Christians, they professed to be the depositories of that "hidden wisdom" which St. Paul was known to have affirmed that he had imparted to those who were capable of receiving it. It is, therefore, not much to be wondered at, that they prevailed amongst the speculative for their very subtilty, and with the vain and weak-minded by their affectation of superior wisdom.

There was another feature of the scheme, which served a further purpose. They pretended that the minds which inhabit human bodies are of two kinds, *spiritual* and *carnal*; that the carnal alone are the work of the Creator of this world, whilst the spiritual are emanations from the highest and purest order of spiritual beings: that the carnal are readily contaminated by the flesh and the world, and thence require restraint and law; whilst the spiritual are only placed in bodies for a time, that they may *know* everything, but incapable of contamination, and destined, after a period of exercise, to be taken up into the Supernal Fulness. By this theory the abstracted and mystical were flattered with the idea of spiritual superiority to their fellow-men; whilst the worldly and sensual might keep up the highest pretensions, and yet wallow in the most revolting profligacy. It was under this latter phase that Gnosticism first showed itself amongst the half-civilized, semi-Roman inhabitants of southern Gaul. In its more abstract and refined form

it would have had no attraction for them; for the European mind is too plain and common-sense to follow subtilities. But its practical licentiousness found a fit nidus in the accompanying sensual disposition which marked the Romans of that age, and all who were tinged with their blood. It worked its way for some time in silence, till the attention of the Bishop of Lyons was drawn to it by the seduction of Christian matrons, and by the influx of extraordinary impurity throughout that region. He was thus led to trace the mischief to its cause; and finding this to be his old enemy, under its then prevailing form of Valentinianism, which thus appeared to be rearing its head everywhere, and had now come to assail him on his own ground, he set himself to understand its system thoroughly, that, by refuting it both in its principle and in its details, he might completely disabuse the Christian world, do away with the divisions, and impurities, and calumnies, arising from it, and thus afford the freer scope for the power of truth upon the hearts and practice of men.

The work was originally written in Greek, of which only fragments have been preserved, but we have a Latin translation of the whole, of very ancient date, as it is quoted by Tertullian. The success of this work was such, that after its appearance, we hear no more of any eminent person who held Gnostic opinions.

Irenæus in opposing the Gnostics, opposed a heresy; we soon after find him taking a manful part in preventing a schism, in which the Church had nearly been involved by the indiscretion of the Bishop of Rome.

Victor, Bishop of Rome, had conceived the idea of using his influence, as the bishop of the principal Church in the world, to bring all Christians to one uniform mode of observing Easter. There had been a variation in very early times, and indeed from the beginning, between the Churches of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia on the one hand, and the rest of the Christian world on the



other, in regard to the keeping of Easter;—other Churches uniting in keeping Easter Day on a Sunday, whilst the Christians of those countries kept it at the Jewish passover, on whatever day of the week it happened to fall. The inconvenience had been felt in the time of St. Polycarp, who sojourning in Rome in the time of its Bishop, Anicetus, they endeavoured each to persuade the other to embrace the practice he followed. But their conferences were without any other effect than to cause both parties to agree to differ in peace.

And now, although other Churches, including those of Gaul, wrote circular letters, at the suggestion of Victor, to the whole Catholic Church, affirming that with them the custom was not to break their paschal fast until the Sunday, still the Churches of Asia Minor adhered to their custom. The haughty Victor therefore issued letters announcing that the Asiatic brethren were cut off from the common unity of Christians. Here, however, he was not followed by those who had previously agreed with him; and Irenæus in particular, in the name of the Christians in Gaul under his jurisdiction, wrote both to Victor and to various other bishops, strongly pressing milder measures, and reminding the Roman prelate of the example of Anicetus, one of his predecessors, who paid Polycarp the highest honour, even when assured that he would not conform to the Western custom, and regarded his own as more apostolical.

What the immediate result of these letters was we are not informed by any contemporary writer. Anatolius, indeed, (if the Latin version of his Treatise on the Paschal Cycle, published by Bucheris, is to be relied on,) asserts that Victor did not persist in his excommunication; and we know subsequently that many Churches in Asia adhered to the Jewish reckoning, and yet were not on that account regarded with any aversion by their brethren; and it was not until the council of Nice that their bishops there assembled, agreed to follow the general

custom,—to which, however, many persons did not conform in the time of Chrysostom.

By papal writers, this measure of Victor is sometimes referred to as if it were a proof of the exercise of papal authority at this early period, but in fact this case proves the very reverse. He made the claim, but as Beaven observes, *the Catholic Church negatived the claim.*

The tradition is, that Irenæus died a martyr under the bitter persecution which was raised against the Christians by the Emperor Severus; but we have no authentic account of his death, or even of the time when it took place.—*Irenæus's Works. Dupin. Beaven.*

#### ISIDORE, OF PELUSIUM.

ISIDORE, of Pelusium, in Egypt, is placed by Cave, in the year 412, and by Basnage, in the year 427. Pagi says, we hear nothing of him after 433, and it is probable that he died in the middle of the fifth century.

Facundus, as referred to by Lardner, says, that he wrote two thousand epistles for the edification of the Church: Suidas says, three thousand, explaining the divine scriptures. There are still extant above two thousand; but they are most of them very short, and not a few of them coincident, treating the same question, and in a like manner. Dr. Heumann has a Dissertation on Isidore of Pelusium, which well deserves to be read. He rectifies divers mistakes of learned moderns; and argues, that most of his letters are fictitious, and not a real correspondence: and he seems to have proved what he advances.

The best edition of St. Isidore's works, is that of Paris, in 1638, fol. in Greek and Latin. They were much studied by the venerated Bishop Jebb, by whom the study of them was recommended to young divines.

So far from depriving men of the Scriptures, as the

Papists do, St. Isidore, writing to a heathen, says, "Two volumes one called the Old, the other the New Testament, which I have sent you, are sufficient to teach you our religion."—*Lib. 1, Ep. 7. Works. Cave. Lardner. Dupin.*

## ISIDORE, OF SEVILLE.

ISIDORE, of Seville, was born at Carthegena, being the son of Severian, governor of that city, of which his brother Leander was bishop. He succeeded his brother in the bishopric, in the year 595 or 596, and occupied that post till the year 636, when he died. He was the author of many works, some of which are these: A Chronicle, from the beginning of the world, to the year of Christ 626; a book of Ecclesiastical Writers, or Illustrious Men, in 33 chapters; Sentences, in three books; Commentaries upon the historical books of the Old Testament; Allegories in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament: Of Ecclesiastical Offices, in two books; A book of Proëms, or Prolegomena, to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; Origines, or Etymologies, in 20 books, left unfinished, and published after his death by Braulio, bishop of Saragossa: and in the three last mentioned works, are catalogues of the books of the Old and New Testament.

Isidore was the author of the Mosarabic Mass, or ancient Spanish Liturgy. The edition of the Missal, 1500, fol., and of the Breviary, 1502, fol., printed by cardinal Ximenes' order, are very scarce: a Treatise on this Liturgy was printed at Rome, 1740, fol.; the Collection of Canons, attributed to Isidore, was not made by him. This spurious collection of Canons was the work of Isidore Macater, who lived in the eight century, and they are called the False Decretals. They contain the pretended decretals of more than sixty popes, from St. Clement to Siricius, and the decrees and epistles



from the latter pope to Zachary. They were carried from Spain into France, about 811, by Reculphus, Bishop of Mayence. The spuriousness of this collection has been ably shown by Blondel, in his *Pseudo Isidorus et Turriannus Vapulantes*. They form a portion of that mystery of iniquity, by which the Papists seek to establish their iniquitous system.

Isidore of Seville, is frequently ranked among musical writers. In his treatise on the Divine Offices, much curious information occurs concerning canto fermo, and music in general; but particularly its introduction into the Church, the institution of the four tones by St. Ambrose, and the extension of that number to eight by St. Gregory. The works of Isidore have been published by Du Breul, Paris, 1601, and Cologne, 1617; Madrid, 1778; and by Arevali, Rome, 1797—1803, 7 vols. 4to. —*Cave. Lardner. Dupin.*

#### ISLIP, SIMON.

The following is Bishop Godwin's account of this archbishop:—"Simon Islip being doctor of law, became canon of St. Paul's, then dean of the Arches, after that was chosen to be of the privy council of King Edward the Third; first in the place of secretary, and then keeper of the privy seal. John Stratford, lying upon his death bed, foretold he should be archbishop. It came to pass within two years after his death, though two other were served before him. The monks, with the kings very good liking, chose him, and the pope would not refuse him: yet being loath to ratify the monks election, he received the same, and *ex plenitudine potestatis*, bestowed the archbishopric upon him. His bulls were published in Bow Church, October 4, 1349, and in the month of December following, he was consecrated by the Bishop of London in St. Paul's Church.

He was enthroned secretly, to save charge ; for he was a very frugal and sparing man, never esteeming pomp or outward bravery : he was also very severe. When he first visited his own diocese, he deprived many clergymen of their livings. He passed through the dioceses of Rochester and Chichester without keeping any great ado, so that every one made account, he was content to wink at the faults he espied. But they found it otherwise : for he afterward called home unto him the offenders, and there dealt so with them as all men might assure themselves he would prove a very austere man in his government. John Synwall, Bishop of Lincoln, standing in doubt of this asperity of his, with great cost procured a privilege from Rome, to exempt himself from his authority and jurisdiction. But the archbishop caused the same, afterward, to be revoked. The university of Oxford had presented unto him the said Bishop of Lincoln, (unto whose jurisdiction Oxford then appertained) one William Palmorin for their chancellor, and prayed him to admit him. The bishop, (I know not for what cause,) delayed his admission from time to time, and enforced the university to complain of this hard dealing unto the archbishop. He presently set down a day wherein he enjoined the bishop to admit this chancellor, or else to render a reason of his refusal. At that time appointed, the proctors of the university were ready together with this William Palmorin to demand admission, and when the Bishop of Lincoln came not, (trusting belike to his privilege aforesaid,) the archbishop caused his chancellor, John Carlton, dean of Wells, to admit him, wrote to the university to receive him, and cited the bishop to answer before him for his contempt. He appealed to the pope, would not come, and for his contumacy was interdicted. Much money was spent in this suit afterwards at Rome. The end was, that the archbishop prevailed, and the other's privilege was by special order of the pope revoked, who also granted unto the

university at the same time that the chancellor hereafter should only be elected by the scholars themselves, and so presently authorised to govern them without the admission of any other. This conquest thus achieved, he entered into another combat in the same land, that is at Rome. He served Andrew Ufford, Archbishop of Middlesex, the administrator of John Ufford, his predecessor, for dilapidations, and recovered of him £1,101. 15s. 2½d.; that money he employed in repairing the palace at Canterbury. He pulled down the manor house at Wrotham, and employed the stones and timber of the same in ending the building that John Ufford, his predecessor aforesaid, had begun at Maidstone. Towards this and other charges he obtained of the pope leave to crave a contribution of four-pence out of every mark, from the clergy of his province. But his officers (whether of purpose, or peradventure mistaking) demanded, and had a whole tenth. All this was within a year or two of his first coming to the archbishopric; at which time also, in a parliament held at Westminster, the year 1350, the old controversy between him and the Archbishop of York, about bearing up his cross in the province of Canterbury, began to be renewed, was compromitted unto the hearing and judgment of the king, who set down a final order for the same, viz. that the Archbishop of York should bear his cross in the other's province, yielding all pre-eminence otherwise unto Canterbury, but that in token of subjection, every Archbishop at his entrance should offer an image of gold to the value of forty pounds, at the shrine of Saint Thomas, the same to be sent by some knight or doctor of the law, within the space of two months after his enthronization. Amongst the rest of his actions, I may not in any wise forget his College of Canterbury, (which is now become a parcel of Christ Church, in Oxford.) He built it, and endowed it with good possessions, appropriating unto the same the parsonages of Pagham and Magfield. He granted also unto



the convent of Canterbury, the churches of Monkton and Estrey. It is worthy remembrance likewise, that when a certain Countess of Kent, after the earl, her husband's death, had professed herself a nun, and having lived so certain years, suddenly married a certain knight, named Eustace Abricourt, contrary to her vow, and that secretly, without asking of bands, or dispensation; he punished them severely for it, but suffered them to live still together, and severed them not. Amongst many good deeds, he is blamed for selling unto the Earl of Arundel the right which he had unto five and twenty deer yearly, out of certain grounds of his. He had for them only two hundred and forty marks. After he had been archbishop fifteen years, four months, and twelve days, he died, April, 26, 1366. Riding to Magfield, his horse chanced to cast him into a miry pool; wet as he was, he fell asleep at his coming thither, and waking, found himself in a palsy, whereof within a few days after he died. He bequeathed unto the church of Canterbury a thousand sheep, his vestments, which were all cloth of gold, a very sumptuous cope, and much plate, viz: five dozen of silver dishes, five salts, and four goodly basons, all en-chased with his arms. He lies buried in the middle of the body of his church of Canterbury, under a fair tomb of marble, inlaid with brass.

## ITTIGIUS, THOMAS.

THOMAS ITTIGIUS, a Lutheran, was the son of John Ittigius, professor of physic at Leipsic, and born there, in 1644. He became professor of philosophy at his native place, and afterwards licentiate and professor in divinity. He died in 1710. Besides several papers in the Leipsic Acts, he wrote, *De Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostolici et Apostolico proximi*; *Appendix de Hæresiarchis*; *Prolegomena ad Josephi Opera*; *Bibliotheca Patrum Apos-*

tolicorum Græco-Latina; Historia Synodorum Nationalium in Gallia à reformatis habitarum; Liber de Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum; Exhortationes Theologicæ; Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ primi et secundi Seculi selecta Capita.—*Moreri*.

#### IVES, OR YVES.

IVES, or YVES, was born in the territory of Beauvais, in 1035, and raised to the see of Chartres in 1092. He particularly signalized his zeal against Philip I. of France, who had put away his wife Bertha, and taken Bertrade, the wife of the count of Anjou, by means of an informal divorce. When this disagreement was composed, Ives confined himself to his clerical functions, and laid several religious foundations. He died 1115, and Pius V., by a bull dated December 18, 1570, permitted the monks of the congregation of Lateran to celebrate the festival of St. Ives. There exist of his compiling:—A Collection of Decrees; *Exceptiones Ecclesiasticarum regularum*; besides twenty-two sermons, and a chronicon, all collected in 1647, and published in one volume folio. A collection of canons, published in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, under the title of, *Parmonia*, or *Pannonia*, are attributed to this bishop.—*Moreri*. *Cave*. *Saxii Onom*.

#### JACKSON, ARTHUR.

ARTHUR JACKSON, a nonconformist, was born at Little Waddingfield, in Suffolk, in 1593. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degrees in arts. On entering into orders, he became lecturer of St. Michael's, Wood Street; after which he obtained the living of St. Faith under St. Paul's, from whence he was ejected in 1662. He was inimical to Cromwell, and

suffered imprisonment in the time of Love's plot, for refusing to give evidence on that occasion. He died in 1666. His Annotations on the Bible were printed in 4 vols. 4to.—*Watkins*.

## JACKSON, JOHN.

JOHN JACKSON, an obscure but troublesome heretic of the last century, was born in 1686, at Lensey, in Yorkshire. From Doncaster School he went to Jesus College, Cambridge, where he took his bachelor's degree, but could not obtain that of master on account of his Arian principles. By the unprincipled men at that time in power, he was for these very principles patronized. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster made him confrater of Wigston's Hospital, in Leicester, which Jackson was unprincipled enough to accept because, though it was assumed that he was a member of the Church of England, no subscription was required of him. He succeeded to the mastership of the Hospital, in 1729. His time was consumed in bitter controversies, but his works, mere ephemeral productions, are not worth enumerating, except his Chronological Antiquities, in 3 vols. 4to.—*Sutton*.

## JACKSON, THOMAS.

THOMAS JACKSON, a divine, was born at Witton, in the county of Durham, in 1579, and was entered of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1595. In the following year he was elected a scholar of Corpus Christi College, of which he was chosen probationer-fellow in 1606. His proficiency in theology occasioned his being selected to read a divinity lecture in his college every Sunday morning. The master and fellows of Pembroke College, soon after its



foundation, appointed him reader of a similar lecture on a week day in that house. He was chosen vice-president of his college several years successively. In 1610, he took the degree of B.D.; and in 1622, that of D.D. Two years afterwards he obtained a benefice in his native country, the rectory of Winston, with which he afterwards held the vicarage of Newcastle, described as "a very populous town, furnished with multitudes of men, and no small variety of opinions." Here he resided, until in 1630 he was elected president of Corpus Christi College, when he resigned his livings. He soon afterwards was nominated chaplain-in-ordinary to Charles I., and was collated to the vicarage of Witney, in Oxfordshire. In 1635, he was made a prebendary of Winchester; and in 1638, he was promoted to the deanery of Peterborough.

Vaughan, his contemporary and biographer, speaking of his private virtues, says:—"His devotions towards God were assiduous and exemplary, both in public and private. He was a diligent frequenter of the public service in the chapel very early in the morning, and at evening, except some urgent occasions of infirmity did excuse him. His private conferences with God by prayer and meditation were never omitted upon any occasion whatsoever. When he went the yearly progress to view the college-lands, and came into the tenant's house, it was his constant custom (before any other business, discourse, or care of himself, were he never so wet or weary) to call for a retiring room to pour out his soul unto God, Who led him safely in his journey. And this he did not out of any specious pretence of holiness, to devour a widow's house with more facility, rack their rents, or enhance their fines. For excepting the constant revenue to the founder, (to whom he was a strict accomptant,) no man ever did more for them or less for himself."

Dr. Jackson died in 1640. "When his death was now approaching," says Vaughan, "being in the chamber

with many others, I overheard him with a soft voice repeating to himself these and the like ejaculations: *I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in His word do I hope; my soul waiteth for the Lord, more than they that watch for the morning. As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness, I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness.* And he ended with this cygnean cantion, Psal. cxvi. 5, *Gracious is the Lord and righteous, yea our God is merciful. The Lord preserveth the simple: I was brought low, and he helped me. Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee.* And having thus spoken, soon after he surrendered up his spirit to Him that gave it."

He was a sound Church of England divine, from whom the most powerful arguments against Romanism might be produced, and yet he was decided in his opposition to Ultra-protestantism. He is a divine whose works may be studied with profit by the most learned theologian; his Patristics and Christology being as profound as his knowledge of Scripture. Perhaps the orthodox view of regeneration has never been more briefly and at the same time more powerfully treated than in the following passage, which is taken from his chapter on Christ's exercise of His everlasting Priesthood:—

"It is no part of our Church's doctrine or meaning, that the washing, or sprinkling infants' bodies with consecrated water, should take away sins by its own immediate virtue. To affirm thus much implies, as I conceive, a contradiction to that apostolic doctrine. The like figure whereunto even Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into heaven," &c. 1 Pet. iii. 21. The meaning of our Church intends no further than thus: That if this sacrament of Baptism be duly administered, the blood, or bloody sacrifice of Christ,

or (which is all one) the influence of His Spirit doth always accompany, or is *concurrent* to this solemn act. But whether this influence of His Spirit or virtual presence of His body and blood be either immediately or only terminated to the soul and spirit of the party baptized, or have some virtual influence upon the water of Baptism as a mean to convey the grace of regeneration unto the soul of the party baptized, whilst the water is poured upon him, is too nice and curious a question, in this age, for sober Christians to debate or contend about. It may suffice to believe that this sacramental pledge hath a virtual presence of Christ's blood, or some real influence from His body, concomitant, though not consubstantiated to it, which is prefigured or signified by the washing or sprinkling the body with water.

“But it will be, or rather is objected, but only by private or some saucy spirits, That if the doctrine of our Church were true and sound, then all that be rightly baptized should be undoubtedly saved, being once washed or cleansed from their sins. The objection were of some force, if the Church of England did hold or maintain such doctrine or tenets as they do which make or favour it; to wit, That the sins of the elect only are remitted by Baptism, or by sacrament of Christ's body and blood; or, that the sins once remitted cannot be remitted afresh; or, that the party which is once pardoned for his sins, before committed, cannot afterwards be condemned. The orthodoxal truth is, That albeit the original sin of children truly baptized in the name of Christ, or the actual sins of young or elder men so baptized, and the sins of their forefathers (so far as it concerns men of riper years to repent them of both) be so truly remitted in Baptism, that neither young men nor old may be baptized again; yet the stipulation of a good conscience, wherein the internal Baptism (as St. Peter tells) doth consist, may and ought, by the law of God and of Christ's Church, to be reiterated.



“And this stipulation of every Christian, male or female, though baptized after they have passed their nonage for civil contracts, ought to be resumed or reacknowledged as often as they intend to receive the sacramental pledges of Christ’s body and blood, either privately or in the public congregation. But for all such as have been baptized in their infancy, the personal resumption or ratification of that vow, which their fathers and mothers in God did make for them at the sacred laver, is to be exacted of them, *ore tenus*, in some public congregation, before they can be lawfully admitted to be public communicants of Christ’s body and blood.”

The temptation to make quotations from this profound divine, is so great, that it must be resisted, for there is scarcely a question in theology upon which a wise answer may not be obtained from this oracle. His works are numerous, and entirely theological. The principal of them consist of: Commentaries on the Apostles’ Creed, in twelve Books, which were published at different periods, from 1613 to 1627. The rest of his compositions are chiefly sermons. A collection of the whole was printed in 1672 and 1673, in 3 vols. folio, with the life of the author prefixed. Bishop Patrick frequently cites his writings in his Commentaries on the Old Testament; and they were much admired and studied by Horne, Bishop of Norwich.—*Vaughan. Oley. Wood.*

## JACOB, HENRY.

HENRY JACOB, a sectary, was a native of Kent, and educated at St. Mary Hall, Oxford. After being precentor of Corpus Christi College, he obtained the living of Cheriton in his native county; but on publishing, in 1604, “Reasons proving the necessity of Reforming our Churches in England,” he found it expedient to withdraw into Holland. After his return he established a

separate congregation on independent principles ; but in 1624, he went to Virginia, where he died. His works, though numerous, are scarce, and wholly controversial.—*Watkins.*

## JAMES, THOMAS.

THOMAS JAMES, to whom we are indebted for the important *Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers by the Papists*, was born about the year 1571, at Newport, in the Isle of Wight, and being educated on the foundation at Winchester School, was elected a fellow of New College, in Oxford, in 1593. He took his M.A. degree in 1599, and the same year, having collated several MSS. of the *Philobiblion* of Richard of Durham, he published it in 4to, at Oxford, with an appendix of the Oxford MSS.; he dedicated it to Sir Thomas Bodley, who was then building his library. In the interim, James proceeded to publish a catalogue of all the MSS. in the college-libraries in both universities, and when compiling it, having free access to the MSS. in each college at Oxford, he perused them carefully, and when he found any society careless of them, he borrowed and took away what he pleased, and put them into the public library. These labours procured him the designation of the founder, to be the first keeper of the public library; in which office he was confirmed by the university, in 1602. He filled this post with great applause, and commencing D.D. in 1614, was promoted to the sub-deanery of Wells, by the bishop of that see. About the same time, the Archbishop of Canterbury also presented him to the rectory of Mongeham, in Kent, together with other spiritual preferments. In 1620, he was made a justice of the peace, and the same year he resigned his office of librarian, and betook himself more intensely to his studies, and of what kind these

were, we learn from himself: "I have of late (says he, in a letter dated May 23, 1624, to a friend) given myself to the reading only of manuscripts, and in them I find so many and so pregnant testimonies, either fully for our religion, or against the papists, that it is to be wondered at." And in another letter to Archbishop Usher, the same year, he assures the primate he had restored 300 citations, and rescued them from corruptions, in thirty quires of paper. He had before written to his grace upon the same subject, in a letter dated January 28, 1623, where, having observed, that in Sixtus, Alphonsus de Castro, and Antoninus's Summæ, there were about five hundred bastard brevities, and about a thousand places in the true authors which are corrupted, that he had diligently noted, and would shortly vindicate them out of the MSS., being yet only conjectures of the learned, he proceeds to acquaint his grace, that he had gotten together the flower of the English divines, who would voluntarily join with him in the search. Some fruits of their labours, continues he, "if your lordship desires, I will send up. And might I be but so happy, as to have other twelve thus bestowed, four in transcribing orthodox writers, whereof we have plenty that for the substantial points have maintained our religion (forty or fifty pounds would serve;) four to compare old prints with the new; four others to compare the Greek translations by the papists, as Vedelius hath done with Ignatius, wherein he hath been somewhat helped by my pains; I would not doubt but to drive the papists out of all their starting-holes. But alas! my lord, I have not encouragement from our bishops. Preferment I seek none at their hands; only forty or fifty pounds per annum for others is that I seek, which being gained, the cause is gained, notwithstanding their brags in their late books." In the convocation held with the parliament at Oxford, in 1625, of which he was a member, he moved to have proper commissioners appointed to collate the



manuscripts of the fathers in all the libraries in England, with the popish editions, in order to detect the forgeries in these last.

Not receiving the support he desired and deserved, this undaunted author determined to execute the work himself, and had made considerable progress in it, when death prevented him from finishing his design; he died in Holywell, at Oxford, in August, 1629.

His works are numerous, and to those who are investigating the subject of papal forgeries, important: it is to be lamented that some competent person is not employed in this work at present. James's chief work, *The Corruption, &c.*, was published in London, in 1611, 4to, and in 1688, in 8vo.—*Biog. Brit. Parr's Life of Usher.*

#### JANEWAY, JAMES.

JAMES JANEWAY was born in 1636, in Hertfordshire, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took his degrees in arts, and obtained a studentship; but being deprived of it in 1662, he set up a dissenting congregation at Rotherhithe. He died in 1674. He published, in addition to sundry Sermons:—1. *The Life of his Brother, John Janeway, a pious nonconformist.* 2. *A Token for Children.* 3. *Legacy to his Friends.*—*Calamy. Biog. Dict.*

#### JANSEN, OR JANSENIUS.

The name of Jansen is chiefly famous for the controversy to which his Augustinus gave rise, after his death. For the History of Jansenism, therefore, the reader is referred to the *Life of Arnauld.*

Cornelius Jansen was born in the village of Acquoy,

near Leerdam, in Holland, and was educated at Utrecht, at Louvain, and at Paris, where he met with John du Verger de Hauranne, afterwards abbot of St. Cyran, with whom he contracted a very intimate friendship. Some time after he went to Bayonne, where the bishop of that city set him at the head of a college which he had recently founded. He spent five or six years in Bayonne, applying himself to the study of the fathers, St. Augustine in particular. In 1617, he returned to Louvain, where he was chosen principal of the college of St. Pulcheria. He took his degree of D.D. in 1619. In 1630, the King of Spain made him professor of the holy Scriptures, and, observing with a jealous eye the intriguing politics and growing power of the French, employed him to write a book, insinuating that they were no good Catholics, since they made no scruple of forming alliances with Protestant states. Jansen performed the task in his *Mars Gallicus*, which procured him the mitre of Ypres, in 1635. He died of the plague in May, 1638. He published a piece, entitled, *Alexipharmacum*, against the Protestant ministers of Bois le Duc, and a defence of that work, entitled, *Spongia Notarum*, against Gilbert Voetius; *Oratio de Interioris Hominis Reformatione*; *Tetrateuchus, sive Commentarius in IV. Evangelia*; *Pentateuchus, sive Commentarius in V. Libros Mosis*; The Answer of the Divines of Louvain, “*de vi obligandi conscientias, quam habent edicta regia super re monetaria*,” Answer of the Divines and Civilians, “*De juramento quod publica auctoritate magistratui designato imponi solet.*” But his *Augustinus*, before alluded to, was his principal work, and he was employed upon it above twenty years. He left it finished at his death, and submitted it, by his last will, to the judgment of the pope. His executors, Fromond and Calen, printed it at Louvain, in 1640, but suppressed his submission. The subject of the work is divine grace, free-will, and predestination.

Mr. Palmer, in reference to the Jansenist controversy, (for which, *see Life of Arnauld*,) builds upon it a most powerful argument against the Papists, shewing the absurdity of the boasting of Romish theologians, when they vaunt the unity of their Church in faith, its sole and exclusive possession of authority for the termination of religious controversies, and its freedom from all heresy. "Romanists" he remarks, "commonly regard the followers of Jansenius and Quesnel as heretics. Their theologians have clearly shown that the judgment of the whole body of pastors of the Roman obedience has been repeatedly pronounced in condemnation of Jansenism. Without speaking of the censure of Jansenius' book, entitled, *Augustinus*, by Urban VIII. in 1641, the five principal tenets of Jansenism (which approximate to the doctrine of Calvin) were condemned by a bull of Innocent X. in 1653; again by Alexander VII. in 1656, whose subsequent bull of 1665 prescribed a formulary, to be signed by all the clergy, receiving the above bulls and condemning the propositions in the *sense* of Jansenius. This was followed, in 1705, by the bull of Clement XI. confirming the former, and condemning the subterfuges of the Jansenists. In 1713, the bull *Unigenitus* was fulminated by Clement XI. against the doctrines of Quesnel, a Jansenist; this was confirmed by the bull *Pastoralis Officii*, the papal synod of Rome, 1725, and by other bulls, rescripts, briefs, &c. of succeeding pontiffs. The Romish theologians prove, that these various bulls were addressed to the universal Church, that they were received by the infinite majority of the Roman bishops, that in consequence all who held Jansenist doctrines were *heretics*, that Jansenism is in fact a damnable heresy, &c.

"Notwithstanding all this, it is a matter of absolute certainty, that Jansenism has, in opposition to all these condemnations, and in spite of the persecution of the temporal powers, continued to exist for nearly two hundred years.



“The Jansenist party is thus described by the historian of this Church in the eighteenth century. ‘Active, intriguing, obstinate, it produced a crowd of writings which wounded charity and perpetuated dissensions. Condemned by the body of pastors, it took shelter in the arms of the secular power, and found support in some of its branches. . . . . The continual declamations in which they indulged, against the pope and the bishops, abased the ecclesiastical power. The obstinacy with which they sustained false miracles, led deists to cast doubts even on those which support Christianity. This party offers to the impartial observer, all the features of a real sect . . . . . the Church was troubled wherever it existed; she was only tranquil where it existed not. During fifty years it rent the Church of France, producing a multitude of incidental disputes, fomenting deplorable illusions, exciting a spirit of opposition, of mutiny, and slander against the bishops. From France this spirit passed to other countries; and in the latter half of the eighteenth century, Germany and Italy saw it develope itself in their bosom, under the protection of some deceived princes, or some seduced ministers. To the same influence must be attributed the changes introduced into the schools of those countries, the errors of their canonists, the reforms attempted at Vienna, Florence, and Naples, the instruction of the university of Pavia, so many writings against the holy see, and that secret but active conspiracy to effect universal alteration in the Church, and to place it under *the secular arm*.’ Such was the boasted unity of the Roman Church during the eighteenth century!”

He verifies these observations by facts in the history of Romanism in all nations, and shows that Jansenism has continued always to exist in the communion of the Romish Church.—*Dupin. Charles Butler. Palmer on the Church.*

## JANSENIUS, CORNELIUS.

CORNELIUS JANSENIUS was born at Hulst, in 1510, and educated at Ghent and Louvain, and in due time became a professor in the university last named. At the council of Trent, whither he was sent in 1562, by Philip II., with Baius and Hesselius, he commanded respect by his learning and modesty, and upon his return to Flanders in 1568, was nominated the first Bishop of Ghent. His works:—A Paraphrase on the Psalms; Notes on the Book of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, the Canticles, and the Book of Wisdom; Commentaries upon some passages in the Old Testament; Concordia Evangelica; Dupin says, this is his great work, and that it is the most perfect harmony of the four Gospels which had till that time appeared. He died in 1576.—*Moreri. Dupin.*

## JANUARIUS.

JANUARIUS was Bishop of Benvento, and suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Diocletian. His body was buried at Naples, and at his sepulchre is performed one of the lying wonders by which the Church of Rome, according to prophecy, is distinguished.—*Butler.*

## JEANES, HENRY.

HENRY JEANES was born in 1611, at Allensay, in Somersetshire, and educated at Hart Hall, Oxford. He afterwards obtained the rectory of Beercrocomb and Capland, Somersetshire, and also of Chedzoy, after Dr. Walter Raleigh's expulsion. He wrote:—A Treatise on Abstinence from Evil; On the Indifferency of Human

Actions; On Original Righteousness; Polemical Tracts against Dr. Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Goodwin, &c.: and, Want of Church Government. He defended Charles I. in a treatise called, *The Image Unbroken*. A Perspective of the Impudence, Falsehood, and Profaneness, published in a Libel, entitled *Iconoclastes*, 1651. This was an answer to Milton, whom he treats with keen severity. He died in 1662.—*Gen. Dict.*

## JENKIN, ROBERT.

ROBERT JENKIN was born at Minster, in the Isle of Thanet, in 1656, and educated at the King's School at Canterbury, and at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow; he held also the office of lady Margaret's professor of divinity. Dr. Lake, on being translated from the see of Bristol to that of Chichester, in 1685, made him his chaplain, and collated him to the precentorship of that cathedral, in 1688. Refusing to take the oaths at the Revolution, he quitted that preferment, and retired to his fellowship, which was not subject then to those conditions, unless the Bishop of Ely, the visitor, insisted on it; and the bishop was, by the college statutes, not to visit unless called in by a majority of the fellows. Upon the accession of George I. an act was passed, obliging all who held any post of £5 a-year to take the oaths, by which Dr. Jenkin was obliged to eject those fellows who would not comply, which gave him no small uneasiness, and he sunk by degrees into a state of mental imbecility. In this condition he removed to his elder brother's house, at South Rungton, in Norfolk, where he died in 1727. His works are:—An Historical Examination of the Authority of General Councils; A Defence of the Profession which Bishop Lake made upon his death-bed; *Defensio*



S. Augustini adversus Jo. Phereponum; An English translation of the Life of Apollonius Tyaneus, from the French of Tillemont; Remarks on Four Books lately published, viz. Basnage's History of the Jews, Whiston's Eight Sermons, Locke's Paraphrase and Notes on St. Paul's Epistles, and Le Clerc's Bibliothèque Choisie; The Reasonableness and certainty of the Christian Religion, of which a fifth edition, corrected, appeared in 1721; and, A brief Confutation of the Pretences against natural and revealed Religion.—*Gen. Dict. Nichols's Bowyer.*

#### JENKIN, WILLIAM.

WILLIAM JENKIN was born at Sudbury, in 1612. After taking his degrees in arts, he was ordained; and in 1641 became minister of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and lecturer of Blackfriars; but was suspended and imprisoned, for a supposed share of Love's plot. At the Restoration he was silenced, and in 1684, committed to Newgate, for holding a conventicle. He died in prison, Jan. 19, 1685. Jenkin was buried with great pomp in Bunhill Fields, and in 1715, a monument was erected to his memory, with a Latin inscription. He published some controversial pieces, and a few sermons. Baxter calls him a "sententious, elegant preacher," a character which may be justly applied to his principal work, *An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Jude.* 2 vols. 4to. and fol.—*Calamy.*

#### JENNINGS, DAVID.

DAVID JENNINGS, a dissenting minister, was born at Kibworth, in Leicestershire, in 1691. He became pastor of a congregation in Old Gravel Lane, in 1718, and

officiated there forty-four years: besides which he was one of the trustees for the management of Coward's charities, and a tutor in the academy founded by that gentleman. In 1749, he obtained the degree of doctor in divinity from St. Andrew's, and died in 1762. His works are:—1. *The Beauty and Benefit of early Piety.* 2. *Introduction to the Use of the Globes.* 3. *Appeal to Reason for the Holy Scriptures.* 4. *A Treatise on Original Sin.* 5. *Lectures on Jewish Antiquities*, 2 vols, 8vo. *An Essay on Medals*, 8vo.—*Watkins.*

## JEROME, SAINT.

EUSEBIUS HIERONYMUS, or SAINT JEROME, was born of Christian parents, at Striden, on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia. It is generally allowed by learned men that he died in 420, but it is not easy to determine the time of his birth. Some have supposed that he was not born till about 342; others place his birth in 329, or 330, or 331.

His father, Eusebius, who was a man of rank and fortune, took great care of his education, and after grounding him well in the language of his own country, sent him to Rome, where he was at the period of the death of Julian, the apostate. One of his masters was the celebrated grammarian, Donatus, author of *Commentaries upon Terence and Virgil*: he seems to have had other masters for logic, and the several branches of philosophy.

At Rome, he plunged at once with the usual ardour of his temperament into study, and afterwards into the vortex of dissipation. But his career of dissipation was short; he repented, was baptized, and quitting Rome, repaired to Gaul, to make researches among the books in the possession of the bishops in that country. His companion in travel was Bonosus.

About the year 370, at Treves, or Triers, his penitence was such, that he determined to devote himself to God's service in a state of perpetual continence. And here he transcribed, with his own hand, a volume of St. Hilary's, concerning Synods, and his Commentaries on the Psalms. Returning from Gaul, he repaired to Aquileia, and staid some time with Valerian, the bishop who had succeeded Fortunatus, and who had entirely cleared that Church from Arianism, with which it had been infected by his predecessor. He drew to him so many learned and virtuous men, that the clergy of Aquileia were in his time famous. Here he met his future opponent, Rufinus, with whom he at this time contracted an intimate friendship. Rufinus was at this time a monk of Aquileia, and in his monastery, St. Jerome shut himself up to pursue his studies, until by some domestic afflictions, the ill-conduct probably of his sister, he found it necessary to leave that place.

On his return to Rome, he began to exercise his talents in the cause of the Church, by refuting the contradictions in doctrine, and the errors of ancient traditions, with which that city was now tried, in place of the persecutions and martyrdoms of earlier times. His fervid imagination and impassioned eloquence made a powerful impression on all who heard him, but more especially on the female portion of his auditors. Many Roman ladies of high birth submitted themselves implicitly to his guidance, and his letters extended his influence to such distant quarters as his discourses could not reach. This, however, was dangerous ground for a man to tread, who had only so recently learned to distrust himself, and there were many around him more ready to anticipate his sliding, than to hold him up in his path. He saw the perils to which he was exposed on every side, and he sought refuge from them in flight. He went into Asia, and gazed with eager eyes on the celebrated cities of Antioch, Smyrna, and Constantinople: he sought



the counsels of Gregory Nazianzen, whose poetic temperament responded to his own. He searched the libraries, plunged deep into the literature of the East, and, at length, disgusted with finding there the same vices and the same discords he had quitted in the West, he fled the haunts of man, and secluded himself in a desert, on the confines of Syria.

“You ask me why I seek the deserts?” says he to Vigilantius: “I answer, in order that I may avoid temptations and combats. ‘Why not rather,’ you will perhaps reply, ‘remain on the field of battle, face the enemy, and win the crown that waits upon victory?—not to fight is to fly: it is the act of a coward.’ I acknowledge it,—I will not dissemble my weakness. I dare not fight in the hope of victory, from the fear that I may one day be overcome. In flying, I am not called upon to resist: in remaining, I expose myself to the alternative of vanquishing, or being vanquished. Why relinquish a certainty for an uncertainty? When once engaged in the struggle, it is at least as possible to be conquered as to conquer. In taking the resolution to fly, I am certain not to be beaten, precisely because I have fled; and I fly only to make sure of not being beaten. Can any one go to sleep with a serpent close to him, and feel secure from harm?”

Such was the negative excellence which Christians, under the increasing influence of monastic life, now began to content themselves with aspiring to; instead of that active virtue by which alone the evils in ourselves can be seen, combated, and removed, and the good strengthened and purified.

St. Jerome had through life to contend with an impetuous and violent temper, and with a temperament which solitude itself was unable to control. “How often” he says, retracing many years afterwards this trying period of his life, “since I fixed my abode in these deserts, in this vast solitude, which, burnt up by

the devouring heats, presents to those who inhabit it only the wildest features,—oh! how often, I may say, have I been transported in idea to Rome, and all its fascinations! Plunged in an abyss of bitterness, I have thrown myself on the floor of my solitary cell,—a coarse hair-cloth covered my hideous figure—my skin, dried and blackened in the sun, was like that of an Ethiopian, and my complexion as livid as a corpse. Thus I groaned and wept throughout the day; and if, during the night, sleep, would sometimes close my eyelids, in spite of all my resistance, scarcely had I the strength to sustain my body, as I fell upon the naked earth. I say nothing of my food. In the deserts, even those who may be ill never permit themselves to drink any thing but water; and they would accuse themselves of a degree of sensuality, in taking any thing that might require the aid of fire in its preparation.” Alas! this same man, who to avoid the torments of hell, condemned himself to a living death in this prison, where he had no other companions than ferocious and venomous beasts—how often was he in imagination transported amidst the dances of the Roman virgins! “Yes, with a visage pale with fasting, I retained a heart burning with desires. In this mortified body, in this flesh prematurely dead, only the fire of the passions remained; criminal remembrances, desires, regrets, all overwhelmed me; I walked up and down,—I wandered about,—I went, I came, not knowing where to seek refuge from myself, until at last I used to throw myself at the foot of the cross, bathing it with my tears, which ran in rivers, and which I wiped away with my hair, and struggling by the severest austerities to subdue my rebel nature. I am not ashamed to confess the misery I endured; so far from it, I groan now to think that I am not what I was then. I well remember having frequently passed whole nights in uttering loud cries, and beating my breast, until the Lord Himself dispersed the tempest that raged within

me, and restored peace to my soul. Sometimes I shrunk even from my very cell, seeming to dread its walls, as the accomplices of my thoughts. Then I would penetrate the inmost recesses of the desert, or wander on the summits of the mountains, or hide myself in the obscurity of the valleys, or the cavities of the rocks—then I prayed, and wept, and mortified my criminal flesh; and more than once, as the Lord is my witness, I saw myself transported to the angelic choirs, and in the raptures of joy ineffable, I have exclaimed, as if from them, — *Because of the savour of Thy ointments, Thy Name is as ointment, therefore do the virgins love Thee.*—Cant. i. 2.”

One of the grand evils of the monastic system in its least objectionable point of view is here to be remarked: St. Jerome was compelled to fix his attention upon himself; he was driven to self-contemplation, and this instead of repairing injured his character.

In this retirement St. Jerome remained for many years, in the exercise of piety and devotion, and in laborious study. He paid especial attention to the Hebrew language, and commenced his Commentaries on Holy Scripture. But the two companions whom he had taken with him into retirement being dead, and his own health having given way, he left the desert and came to Antioch, where he was ordained priest. But he accepted holy orders with an express understanding that he might resume a life of solitude if he saw fit, which after a while he did, taking up his abode at Bethlehem. Here he continued his Hebrew studies, having a Jew for his master, and making himself master of the Chaldee and Syriac languages. He could not, however, refrain from seeking relaxation from severer studies, by recourse to the Classics, which had been the delight of his youth. To these things he refers in his letter to Eustochium a Roman lady, illustrious for her virtue, as well as from her family. “It is now many years,” says he, “that



I quitted country, father, mother, sister, relatives, and, what is sometimes difficult to detach one's self from, a splendid table and other luxuries, to which I had always been accustomed, with the intention of going to Jerusalem, to serve God there, and enrol myself in His holy army. The only worldly treasures I brought with me were the books that I had collected at Rome, with great labour and expense, and which I could not prevail upon myself to give up. Such, at that time, was my miserable state, and the excess of my passions, that I fasted rigidly, in order that I might, by this penance, seem to earn the privilege of reading Cicero. After frequent and intense vigils, after torrents of tears, drawn from me by the recollection of my early errors, I took up Plato; and when afterwards, calling home my thoughts, I returned to the reading of the prophets—their style appeared to me rude and negligent. Blind that I was, I ventured to accuse the light."

The conflicts of his mind at length threw him into a violent fever, which, to use his own words, penetrated to the very marrow of his bones, and allowed him no respite to his sufferings, day or night. During its paroxysms, he was tormented with visions that reproached him with the delight he took in his profane readings; and so powerful was the impression made on his mind by the severity of their warnings, that, when he recovered his consciousness, the first use he made of his returning reason was to abjure, for the rest of his life, the studies which had solaced its most trying moments. That which we have once brought ourselves to relinquish, is, we are always very ready to believe, falling into dis-esteem with others also;—and hence, some years afterwards, we find him speaking with great satisfaction of his once favourite writers being no longer the objects of universal admiration. "What man," says he, in one of his letters to his esteemed Paula, "now reads Aristotle? How few are there who know the writings, or even the name of Plato!

whilst our plain humble apostles, our fishers of men, are known and cited throughout the world."

Jerome had visited Constantinople expressly to receive instructions from Gregory of Nazianzum, on his method of explaining the holy Scriptures; and it was this great task which he now resolved to make the principal occupation of his future life. He had been invited to this labour by Damasus, Bishop of Rome; and perhaps there could not have been found at that time, in the whole range of the Christian world, another so capable of the herculean task. He had published a commentary on the prophet Obadiah in his youth; but this work bore many marks of inexperience, as he frankly owned in maturer age; regretting his indiscretion, in having given so unconcocted a performance to the world: but now his judgment was ripened, his habits of inquiry and meditation confirmed, and his multifarious learning equal to whatever demands might be made upon it. It is almost solely to him we are indebted for the version of the holy Scriptures styled the Vulgate. Before his time a bad translation of the Septuagint, known by the name of Italic, was chiefly in use, and the Septuagint itself, being multiplied into as many copies as there were Christian provinces in need of them, was exceedingly corrupted in its text, owing to the ignorance and mistakes of transcribers. Jerome not only corrected these errors, but, profoundly versed in the knowledge of the sacred tongue, also reformed the Greek text after the Hebrew, and gave a new version of all the books received as canonical, adding to them those of Judith and Tobit.

There were as many variations in the Latin translations of the New Testament, as in the Greek of the Old. Jerome applied himself with equal assiduity to the correction of one as of the other; he added prefaces, commentaries, and dissertations, illustrative of the historical and doctrinal points, and embodied in them a

great portion of the immense correspondence which the reputation of his labours drew upon him, from all parts, on subjects connected with the Scriptures. Equally versed in polite literature, as in the profound study of ancient times, he may be justly considered among the Latins what Origen is among the Greeks; there was not a writer of Greece or Rome with whom he was not familiar: his intimate acquaintance with their beauties sometimes led him into a pomp of erudition, and a profuseness of citations, which have been deemed faults in his compositions, critically considered, but which are willingly pardoned by the reader, in consideration of the general justness of their application. The driest questions became interesting under his manner of treating them; the vehemence, the impetuosity with which he wrote, never injured the solidity of his reasoning, and his style, like his own character, in shaking off restraint, only became more powerful and more exalted. Nevertheless it must be acknowledged, that the same peculiarities of style and character were exhibited sometimes, in the course of his long life, in a light from which his friends turned their eyes away in sorrow, whilst his enemies rejoiced to fix attention on them; so true it is, that the errors of the good are the triumphs of the bad.

Among the instances of the bitterness of his reproofs, and the impetuosity of his resentments, must be mentioned, more particularly his controversy with Rufinus, priest of the Church of Aquileia, and long his most intimate friend, as we have already remarked; but who embracing some of the paradoxical opinions of Origen, was treated by Jerome, ever afterwards, in his zeal for the truth, with a severity which, if he had only had private wrongs to complain of from him, he certainly would not have manifested.

In the year 382, St. Jerome was summoned to attend a council convened at Rome by Damasus, the then



bishop, Jerome being a presbyter of the Roman diocese. He accordingly went thither, accompanied by the celebrated Epiphanius, at that time Bishop of Cyprus. It was now that Jerome re-appeared in Rome, with all the saintly dignity of long-tried virtue, in the maturity of age, the full vigour of his genius, and invested with the reputation of the extensive labour he was engaged in upon the Sacred Writings. Continually consulted on questions of the faith, his decisions became more influential than ever; and over the minds of the female sex in particular, he reigned with a power that might have been termed despotic, so far as the implicit obedience of his subjects was concerned, had it not been exercised with a tenderness of zeal, that gave it more of a parental than a priestly character. Many Roman ladies, whom in early life he had detached from the pride and pomp of their elevated rank, he still found engaged in the practice of the virtues of the Gospel taught them, and continuing them, by their example, to their children. It was impossible for a man devoted and enthusiastic as himself, to see, without transports of gratitude and admiration, the heiresses of the noblest names of Rome in her

“High and palmy state,”

the daughters of the Scipios, the Marcelluses, the Camilluses, of the mistress of the world, thus, rescued from the idolatries of their ancestors, devoting themselves to good works, and gladly sacrificing their youth, their beauty, and their wealth, to the relief of the poor and the afflicted; as if Providence was willing to draw forth the meekest consolations of humanity, from the bosom of those very families, whose overweening haughtiness and luxury had before oppressed the world.

It was to Fabiola, of the house of Fabius, that under the direction of St. Jerome, Rome was indebted for its first hospitals; endowing them with her immense wealth,

and devoting all her time to a personal attendance on the sick and destitute, admitted into them, she gave the astonished Pagans the example of virtues they had not even thought of, and for which they would have gladly accounted, by supposing some of the imaginary attributes of their own divinities connected with them.

The ascendancy of Jerome was not seen by the priesthood of Rome without considerable jealousy, and the fearlessness with which he attacked the vices that had already begun to mingle with their functions, increased their resentments against him. Speaking of the avarice of the clergy, he says, "Is it not a disgrace to us that the priests of false gods, jugglers, mountebanks, the most infamous persons may be legatees? Our priests and monks only are prevented from it—interdicted by a positive law, and this law not one framed by the emperors who were enemies to our religion, but by Christian princes. As for the law itself, I do not regret that it has been made, but I regret that we have required it. It was a wise foresight that dictated it, but it is not strong enough to protect against avarice, and we can even boast of eluding it by fraudulent trustees." Of their luxury he speaks yet more severely. "I am ashamed," says he, "to say it, but there are men who seek the priesthood, and the offices of deacons, only that they may see women with less restraint. Dress is all their care. Their hair is curled with tongs, their fingers blaze with the fire of their diamond rings; and they scarcely touch the ground with their feet, so afraid are they of a little damp or dirt. You would think, to see them, that they were youthful bridegrooms instead of priests."

The avaricious and the luxurious recognised their portraits in these delineations, and revenged themselves by calumniating the author. They accused him, in their turn, of abusing the pious friendships he cultivated with the softer sex; and he, unwilling, by persisting in them, to give the slightest foundation for malignity to build

upon, resolved to return to his humble cell in Bethlehem. The death of the bishop, Damasus, at this time, hastened his determination, as it deprived him of one of the warmest and most powerful advocates. Previous to his departure he wrote to Asella, a Roman lady, with whom he had long been on terms of the most endearing intimacy, to clear himself from the calumnies brought against him; he concludes his letter with the most affectionate adieus.

“It is at the moment of my embarking, noble Asella, that I write, full of grief, my eyes bathed in tears, yet thanking God that he has judged me worthy to be hated of men. Senseless that I was, I thought to sing the song of the Lord in a strange land; and, abandoning Mount Sinai, I went after the vain hopes of Egypt. I ought to have remembered the way-faring man in the Evangelists, who had scarcely set out from Jerusalem, ere he was despoiled and beaten, and left for dead . . . . My enemies have sought to cover me with the disgrace of crimes of which I am innocent; but I know we may arrive at heaven equally with a bad, as a good name. Salute for me Paula and Eustochium, who, let the world say what it may, will ever continue to be my sisters in Christ. Salute Alibina, their mother, Marcella, Marcellina, and Felicia, and say to them we shall all meet one day before the tribunal of God, when the conscience of each will be laid open. Adieu! model of the purest virtue. Bear me in your remembrance, and offer up your prayers, that the waves may be appeased on my voyage.”

Embarking at Ostia, Jerome returned by a long circuit into the East, visiting in his route the islands of the Greek Archipelago, passing through Antioch, and staying some time at Alexandria, to profit by the multifarious knowledge of Didymus the blind, the original inventor of raised types for enabling those deprived of sight to enjoy the blessing of reading, and the wonder of



his age for his erudition and ingenuity. Then traversing again Egypt and Palestine, he finally arrived once more at the harbour of his cell in Bethlehem. Paula, with her daughter Eustochium, followed him into Palestine, and founded there, under his direction, two monasteries, one for men, and another, distributed into three communities, for her own sex.

Jerome at the same time undertook the direction of a certain number of children, and continued his labours upon the Sacred Writings: his pious occupations were, however, disturbed by the disastrous state of declining Rome; that mighty empire which had, during ten centuries of triumphant fortune, subjugated the whole world to its sway; but which now undermined, even by the excess of its wealth, and by the corruption of manners attendant on it, trembled from its base, and began to give way on every side. Sustained awhile by the vigour of Theodosius the Great, it speedily fell under the weakness of his successors. The conquered nations, long watching for the moment of vengeance, at length perceived it nigh, and precipitated themselves at once upon the undefended frontiers. The Goths rushed like a torrent over Italy, rich with the spoils of the world, and its easy conquest excited the avarice of twenty other nations, ignorant of all arts but those of destruction. The West was covered with a cloud of barbarians—the Gauls became the prey of the Vandals—Alaric entered a conqueror into Rome with the Huns—Ataulphus, still more cruel, devastated it with even greater fury. St. Jerome beheld, as it may be said, these calamities from his cell: he groaned over them in spirit, and his language rises almost to inspiration as he describes them. “I am horror-stricken,” says he, “at the heaps of ruins which everywhere meet our eyes. For more than twenty years the country which separates Constantinople from the Julian Alps has been saturated with Roman blood. Seythia, Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, Thessalonica,

Achaia, Epirus, Dalmatia, both the Pannonias, are all at the same time invaded, contested, ravaged by the Goths, the Sarmatians, the Quadri, the Alans, the Huns, the Vandals, the Marcomans. How many illustrious ladies—how many virgins consecrated to the Lord—how many people equally respectable by their rank and virtues; have been the prey of their brutal fury! How many bishops carried away into captivity! How many apostles massacred! Churches depopulated, sacred temples overthrown, and altars turned into stables, by these barbarians! The relics of the martyrs have been taken from their tombs; every where are lamentation and mourning—every where is to be seen the image of death, multiplied in a thousand shapes. From one end of the world to the other, the empire crumbles into dust—and only our pride survives, to stalk with up-raised head amidst the ruins. Can there be any remains of nobleness or courage at Athens, at Lacedæmonia, among the people of Arcadia, nay throughout all Greece, subjugated as they are at this moment to the yoke of barbarians! The East seemed safe from these calamities—it only knew of their existence by the reports which were spread of them from afar; but behold, during the course of the year which has just closed upon us, a troop of wolves, not from Arabia, but from the midst of the most distant rocks in Caucasus, has poured down upon its vast provinces, with torrent-like impetuosity. What monasteries have become their prey! What rivers they have made to blush with human blood! Antioch besieged by them, every city bathed by the Halys, the Cydnus, the Orontes, the Euphrates, threatened by their arms; bands of captives carried far from their country; Arabia, Phœnicia, Palestine, Egypt, mute with terror!—No! if I had a hundred mouths, a hundred tongues, a voice sonorous as brass, they would not suffice to describe such a host of evils.”

Jerome did not, however, content himself with lament-

ing over the misfortunes of the civilized world at this astounding period; he threw open the monasteries to the crowds of strangers, who fled from Rome in flames, to seek an asylum in Palestine; among the consecrated spots, which seemed to have been prepared for them beforehand, under the blessing of Providence, by the foresight of Christian piety and zeal. He sold for them the little that remained of his patrimonial property, and lavished on their afflictions, at the same time, the most generous attentions of hospitality, and the most soothing consolations of religion. He received many of the illustrious fugitives, accustomed to purple and fine linen, in his own humble cell, close to the spot where the King of kings, and Lord of lords came into the world, to give an example of voluntary poverty and suffering. The descendants of Scipios and the Gracchi crowded round the foot of Calvary for consolation. Jerome was then writing his Commentary on Ezekiel; he applied to Rome the words of the prophet on the ruin of Tyre and Jerusalem, "Wherefore I will bring the worst of the heathen, and they shall possess their houses, I will also make the pomp of the strong to cease, and their holy places shall be defiled: mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumour upon rumour. . . . ." But when he came to the words, "They shall remove, and go into captivity; and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall scatter them among the nations, and disperse them in the countries," he cast his eyes upon the unfortunates who had sought his protection; and the rugged Dalmatian, the self-subdued Christian, was overcome, as he attempted to speak, and melted into tears of compassion and anticipating dread.

The virtues which excited the respect of the Barbarians themselves, could not defend Jerome against the malice of his Christian adversaries, even in this time of general calamity. The Pelagians and Luciferians set fire to the two monasteries which he had founded at



Bethlehem, conjointly, as we have already said, with Paula and Eustochium her daughter, and chased him for a time, from his cherished retreat. They could not, however, deprive him of his final resting-place, near the spot he had loved so well. He died on the 30th of September, 420, and his remains, already wasted to a skeleton by his continued abstinences, were buried in the grotto of his monastery at Bethlehem.

Jerome, whose various treatises and expositions evince a deep research into the sacred Scriptures, is very explicit in his declarations of their supreme authority, and the importance of a general acquaintance with their contents. In the following passage he seems to speak almost prophetically, both of the ignorance of Scripture, which popery induced, and the influence which a revival of scriptural knowledge had, in awakening the people from this benighted state. "Before the second coming of Christ, the people, who under their former masters were immersed in sleep, shall quickly rise up and go to the mountains of the Scriptures, and there will find the mountains of Moses, and Joshua, the mountains of the Prophets, the mountains of the New Testament, the Apostles and Evangelists, and having flown to these mountains, and being exercised in their perusal, although there were none to teach them, yet will their study be approved, because they had recourse to these mountains, while the idleness of their masters shall be reprovèd." And a little before, on the same chapter, "He will enclose himself with the doctrines and reasonings of Scripture, as with a strong wall, that the enemy may not break in upon him."

In his comment on Isaiah xlix. 8, "Thus saith the Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee," he has this expressive observation; "When they shall have turned, and shall behold the clear light of Christ, they shall feed in the paths and ways of the holy Scriptures,

and shall say, the Lord feedeth me and I shall want nothing." On Haggai, i.—11. "Those things which they make and find, as it were, by apostolical tradition, without the authority and testimony of Scripture, the sword of God smites." And again, on the first chapter of Micah. "The Church of Christ, which contains the Churches of all the world, is joined together in the unity of the Spirit, and has the cities of the law and of the prophets, of the gospel and the apostles; and it goes not beyond its bounds, which is the holy Scriptures."

In his letter against Helvidius, he remarks, "As we do not deny those things which are written, so we reject those which are not written. That God was born of a virgin we believe, because we read it,—that Mary married after she was delivered, we do not believe, because we do not read it." He mentions it in the life of his friend Paula, as the greatest excellency of her character, that she continued to study the Scriptures. "She committed all the Scriptures to memory, and although she loved the history, considering it the fountain of the truth; yet she sought more after the spiritual import, which her mind coveted, as the crown of the spiritual edifice. She requested me to allow her and her daughter to read to me the Old and New Testament, that I might explain them to her, which, from her earnest importunity, and continued request, I could not refuse." He thus appreciated uninspired writers, "Then we judge of their worth only, without considering the dignity of the name, and the reader looks only to what he reads, not considering whose it is; whether it be bishop or layman, general or lord, common soldier or servant: whether he is clothed in purple or silk, or in the meanest and coarsest rags, he shall be judged, not according to his degree of honour, but according to the merit of his works."

The Romanists of the present day strongly object to scriptural education, maintaining that to permit children

to read the Bible would tend to the perversion of the faith. That it would tend to the subversion of that faith which is not founded on God's holy Word, we readily admit; but that it can be in any way detrimental to the true faith of the gospel, we as firmly deny. In support of this position, we can bring forward the further evidence of Jerome, who, far from considering an early acquaintance with the Scriptures as injurious to the true Catholic faith, impresses it upon parents, as an imperative duty, to bring up their children from their infant years, in the ways and knowledge of the Lord. "Instead of silk or jewels, (he says to Læta,) let your daughter learn to love the holy books. Let her first learn the Psalms, and employ herself in these holy songs, and in the Proverbs of Solomon, let her learn the way of life. By studying the book of Ecclesiastes, let her be accustomed to tread under foot the things that are of the world: teach her to follow the examples of courage and patience, related in the book of Job: hence let her pass to the Gospels, which should never be out of her hands; seek to impress her heart with the precepts of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles; and afterwards let her read the Law, the Prophets, and the rest of the Old Testament."

In writing to Gaudentius, respecting the education of a child that had been committed to his care, he tells him,—“When she is seven years old, make her learn the Psalms by heart; and as she grows older, let her read the books of Solomon, the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Prophets; thus she will be taught to lay them up in her heart, as her greatest treasure.” “I know (he says, writing to Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria,) that I place the apostles in a different rank from all other writers; they always speak the truth, but as for the others, they err in some things as men.”

While St. Jerome is thus decided against the Romanists, who would rob the people of the Bible, equally



strong is he against the papal supremacy, although there may be a few passages in his correspondence with his friend and patron Damasus, Bishop of Rome, where he speaks in somewhat exalted strains of that prelate; yet we find him in so many other instances, asserting in the strongest terms, the equality of the apostles in the first place, and of the bishops, as the succeeding governors of the Church in the next, that we must necessarily conclude, that he never entertained the remotest idea of ascribing any pre-eminence to the Roman see. "The Church (he says) is built upon all the apostles, the strength of the Church is founded equally upon all." "You will say the Church is built on Peter, although the same is affirmed in another place of all the apostles." In his comment on the prophet Amos. "Christ was the rock, and he bestowed on the apostles, that they should also be called rocks."

So much for the equality of the apostles, and as for that of the bishops, he speaks even still more decidedly. "Wherever (he observes) there is a bishop, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thanis, he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood; the power of wealth, or the lowliness of poverty, does not make a bishop higher or lower, for all are successors of the apostles." He also confirms the evidence we have before adduced, respecting the Arianism of the Roman bishop, Liberius. In his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, speaking of Fortunantius, he says of him, "For this he is to be detested, because he first solicited, and prevailed on Liberius, Bishop of Rome,—who had been exiled for the faith,—to subscribe to heresy." Again, in his chronicle, he informs us "that Liberius, worn out with the toils of banishment, and having subscribed to heretical pravity, entered Rome as a conqueror." And how much would it have contributed to the peace of the world, and of Rome, itself, had its bishops followed his excellent

advice,—“ Let the bishops be content with their honour, let them recollect that they are fathers, not lords, that they should be loved, not feared.”

St. Jerome, in his commentary on the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew, thus speaks of the institution of the Lord's Supper. “ He took bread that comforts man's heart, and proceeded to the true sacrament of the passover; that as Melchisedec, the priest of the most high God, represented him when he offered up bread and wine, so he also might represent the truth of his body and blood.” And in another place, he observes, “ He did not offer up water, but wine, for a TYPE of his blood.”

Against the Romish purgatory he can also be produced as a witness. “ When the soul” he says, “ freed from the bonds of the body, shall have liberty to fly whither it will, or whither it is compelled to go, it shall be either carried to hell, of which it is written,—the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the people that forget God,—and in hell, who shall confess to thee? or it shall be lifted up to heaven.” He consoles his friend Paula, very impressively, on the death of her daughter: “ Let the dead be lamented, but let it be such as Gehenna doth receive, as hell doth devour, for whose punishment everlasting fire doth burn. But let us, whose departure a crowd of angels doth attend, whom Christ comes forth to meet, be more grieved, if we dwell long in this tabernacle of death, because while we remain here, we are pilgrims from God. Such being our condition, I would say with the prophet,—Woe is me, that I dwell in the tents of Kedar. If then Kedar is darkness, and the world is also in darkness, because the light shined in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not, we should rejoice that our Blessillas has passed from darkness to light, and obtained the crown prepared for those who have finally overcome. If you believe that your daughter lives, do

not lament that she has passed to a better place; for the apostle commands us not to grieve for the dead, as the heathen do, who have no hope." In his commentary on the first chapter of Lamentations, quoting the words of our Lord,—“Thou shalt by no means come out thence until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing,” he observes,—“He shall never come out, because he must ever pay the uttermost farthing, while he suffers everlasting punishment for his sins, committed in the world.” Again, on the first chapter of Joel,—“That which shall happen unto all at the day of judgment, is accomplished in every one at the day of death.” And on the sixth chapter of Galatians,—“While we are in the present world, we may help one another by our prayers or advice; but when we shall come before the judgment seat of Christ, neither Job, Daniel, nor Noah, can intreat for any one, but every one must bear his own burden.”

St. Jerome does not confine the prayers and praises of God to the Greek or Latin tongue, but speaks of the most distant and barbarous nations, as showing forth in their several languages, the praises of the Lord.—“Now both the voices and letters of all nations, do sound out Christ’s passion, and resurrection. I speak not of the Jews, Greeks, and Latins, which nations the Lord has dedicated with the title of his cross. The savage nature of the Bessians, and other people, who in their wildness were clad with skins, and were accustomed to immolate their fellow beings, have turned their barbarous speech, into the sweet harmony of Christ, who is now the voice of the world.” Describing the funeral of his friend Paula, he says,—“There was collected together from Jerusalem, and the neighbouring cities, a number of bishops, priests, and other ecclesiastical persons; the monks and virgins of the monasteries, reciting and responding in chorus. Tears and lamentations were not heard, as among worldly mourners, but



the continued singing of psalms, and praises of the Lord, recounted by a number of holy men, in various languages. From the whole province of Palestine, the people were assembled, the poor, and the widows, showing, as in the case of Dorcas, the garments she had made them, and all the multitude mourning as for a mother and a friend. *There, were heard, the psalms of the Prophet, sung by the people in their different tongues, Greek, Latin, and Syriac.*" He reprehends the heretics of his day, for keeping the people in ignorance, and in doing so, speaks decidedly against the similar proceedings of the Papists.—“*With a barbarous and unknown sound, they astonish the simple people, that what they do not understand, they may the more admire.*”

The editions of St. Jerome are as follow :—*Hieronymi Opera*, cura *Erasmi*, fol. 6 vols. Basil. 1516 ; *Hieronymi ap Froben*. Basil. 1553. A beautiful and correct edition ; *Hieronymi Rom*. 1572 ; *Hieronymi Colon*. 1623, with Notes and Emendations ; *Hieronymi Francof*. 12 vols. 1684, with Indices, Notes, Scholia, &c. collected into the three last volumes ; *Hieronymi Edict. Benedictin*. cura *Martianai*, 5 vols. fol. Paris. 1693—1706. This is by far the best edition, containing Dissertations, and Notes, and Critiques, written with great skill and learning : the four first vols. are composed of the genuine works of St. Jerome, and the last contains those that have been ascribed to him : The Select Epistles of St. Jerome, translated into English, 4to. Lond. 1630 ; Directions for Studying ; and also the Epistle to Nepotian, by T. Bennet, 8vo. Lond. 1715 ; The Vulgate has been translated into English, and frequently printed since the first translation of the New Testament, from this Version, made by John Wicliff between the years 1378—80, edited and published by J. Lewis, fol. Lond. 1731.—*Erasmus. Book of the Fathers. Cave. Dupin. Fleury Lardner. Keary.*

## JEWEL, JOHN.

JOHN JEWEL was born on the 22nd of May, in the year 1522, at Buden, in the parish of Berinber, in Devonshire. For his earliest training in the rudiments of grammar, he appears to have been indebted to the good offices of his maternal uncle, John Bellamy, of Hampton. He was then successively removed to Bramton, Southmalton, and afterwards to Barnstaple. He became a post-master of Merton College, Oxford, in 1635, and arrived at the university at a time when the corruptions of the Church of England had awakened the disgust of every honest mind, and the desire of a Reformation was openly expressed. Jewel, through the judicious management of his tutor, John Parkhurst, then a fellow of Merton, and afterwards bishop of Norwich, was led to take the protestant side in the prevalent religious discussions. In 1539, Jewel removed to Corpus Christi College, where he greatly distinguished himself by his learning, and was much beloved, until his superiority awakened the jealousy of some little and inferior minds which caused him some disturbance. He took his B.A. degree in 1540, and during the next seven years laboured diligently as a lecturer and tutor, while he was fitting his own mind with those prodigious stores of learning which were in after-life so serviceable to him. On the accession of Edward VI., Jewel made open profession of his protestant principles, and from that time was considered as among the foremost men of the reforming party of the Church of England. On the appointment of Peter Martyr to the chair of theology, in Oxford, it was the misfortune of Jewel to form a confidential intimacy with that distinguished foreigner, who had not, and could not be expected to have those good old English feelings, which in all our reformations, civil and ecclesiastical, have enabled us to steer the middle course between too

great stiffness, and too much laxity. The affectionate, grateful disposition of Jewel, made him susceptible of strong feelings of friendship, and his deference to Peter Martyr and some other foreigners, was injurious to his principles throughout his life. In 1550, Jewel took his B.D. degree, and to be engaged in pastoral work, accepted the living of Sunningwell, near Oxford, a benefice of very trifling value.

On the accession of Mary, the Romanizing party regained the ascendancy in our Church and in the universities, and Jewel was among the earliest of those who felt the pelting of the storm. Those who had long regarded him with feelings of jealousy and envy, succeeded in driving him from his college, on the ground of his friendship with Peter Martyr, and on the charge of his having taught heresy. It is clear, that he attributed this to mere party spirit in his own college, for he did not take alarm, or retire from his university, but sought and found an asylum in Broadgates Hall, near Pembroke College. The university also employed him in the capacity of orator, to compose an address of congratulation to the queen. It is evident, that although there was ground for anxiety, Jewel and some others had not taken alarm. The ministers of Mary were most of them men who had complied with the changes in the reign of Henry VIII., and the expectation may have been, that things would have been brought back to the position in which he had left them, and to conform to such regulations would not have been impossible. It was impossible to conjecture how far a concession would be made to the wishes of the reformers, even though from the excesses of the reformers in the reign of Edward VI. a reaction had taken place. Jewel did not hesitate, therefore, to perform his duty as public orator, and he did it with the discretion of one whose object was not to give unnecessary offence to either of the parties in the Church.

But it soon became apparent that the Romanizers



did not intend to bear their triumph meekly. Jewel was frequently insulted, and began to feel alarm; he at length undertook a journey to Cleve, on foot, in the midst of frost and snow, for the express purpose of advising with his constant friend, Parkhurst, respecting the fittest course of proceeding under the impending dangers. To his cruel disappointment, he found, on his arrival, that Parkhurst had already fled. The restoration of the Mass had been sufficient to satisfy *him*, that to remain longer at Cleve would be no better than madness; and, accordingly, nothing was left for Jewel but to return, in weariness and dejection, to the scene of danger at Oxford. It must have been subsequently to this dispiriting journey, that he wrote two short and hasty letters to Parkhurst, intimating the deepest anxiety for the safety and welfare of his friend, but showing that the writer was then ignorant where the object of his correspondence was to be found. In the former of these letters he says—"My own Parkhurst, what am I to believe is now become of you? Are you living or dead? Are you weeping? or, are you in the *Fleet*? *News* with us there is none. Of things *old* we have enough, and too much. Unless the trouble is too great, write me back in what position your affairs now are—what your hopes and what your fears." Again, in his second letter, written a few days after, he asks—"What shall I write to you, or wherein shall I be silent? I have long been anxious to know what you are doing at present, what you have been doing, and *whereabouts you are*. Although Cleve has been taken from you, and everything else has been changed, your own courage, I trust, can neither be taken from you, or altered." From these letters it is obvious that Jewel was ignorant, when he wrote them, of the abode and fortunes of Parkhurst: and as they were dated from Oxford, it is equally clear that they must have been written subsequently to his return from his abortive expedition to Cleve,

which was undertaken in the expectation of finding Parkhurst *there*.

It was at a time when the spirits of Jewel had been thus distracted with perplexity and apprehension, that Marshall contrived to let loose upon him the familiars of persecution. At his instigation, they presented to him a paper containing the most essential doctrines of the Romish Faith; and they demanded his subscription, on pain of martyrdom by fire. The resolution of Jewel, (unfortunately for his good fame, though, in some respects, most fortunately for the Church,) was not proof against the assault. Not a moment was allowed for deliberation, or for consulting with his friends. Instant compliance, or the certainty of an agonizing death, was the only alternative before him; and flesh and spirit sunk under the trial. He took the pen in his hand; and, with an air of levity which must sadly have belied the heaviness of his heart, he said, "What! have you a mind to see how well I can write?" He then hastily set his name to the paper and thus wrote himself—an *apostate*.

From that moment, says Mr. Le Bas, with his usual force, Jewel was a heart-stricken man. He had to encounter from his friends the "altered eye of hard unkindness," or the yet more intolerable look of sorrow and compassion. From his enemies he was condemned to endure the scowl of unsated malice which still thirsted for his blood. All these circumstances conspired to make his situation insufferably wretched, and to persuade him, at last, that Oxford was no place for him. He accordingly resolved, though too late for his honour or his peace, to flee for his life, and to seek an asylum among his brethren on the continent.

His escape, it seems, was almost through the very fire! Had he remained in Oxford but one night longer, he must inevitably have perished; nay, had he travelled to London by the direct road, his pursuers would have been upon him. Whether by accident or design, however, he

fortunately took a different way. Notwithstanding his lameness, he was under the necessity of going on foot, and having travelled till he was exhausted with weariness and misery, and half dead with cold, he threw himself on the ground; and that night would probably have been his last, if he had not been providentially discovered by Augustine Berner, a Swiss, who had been a servant to Bishop Latimer, and was afterwards a minister of the Gospel. To that faithful servant of God, Jewel owed his preservation. Berner, on seeing his wretched condition, immediately provided him with a horse, and conveyed him to the house of the Lady Ann Warcup, a widow, who was a firm friend to the suffering Protestants. From her he received entertainment and protection, until a convenient opportunity occurred for sending him on to London.

But even in London his situation was imminently perilous. He was compelled to change his lodgings several times. Happily he found a powerful friend in Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, who kindly furnished him with money for his journey, and procured him a safe passage to the continent. He immediately repaired to Frankfort, which was then a chief city of refuge for the persecuted Reformers; and arrived there at the beginning of the second year of Queen Mary's reign, that is, somewhere about July or August, 1556.

At Frankfort, Jewel found himself in the midst of a great company of English fugitives, from whom he met with a most cordial and fraternal welcome; more especially, because he appeared among them as one recovered from the very jaws of destruction. Still it could not be forgotten that he brought with him a name tainted by the odour of unfaithfulness. And it was quite indispensable that this evil savour should be cleansed away, by a public act of confession and penitence, before he could be received into the full confidence of his brethren in adversity. He was, therefore, advised, in the strongest man-



ner, to make an open and voluntary retraction of his subscription; and the two persons, by whom this measure was most urgently recommended, were Samson, late dean of Chichester, and his old benefactor Chambers, who were both at Frankfort when Jewel arrived there. Little intreaty however was required. The councils of his friends found an immediate echo in his own heart; and he followed their suggestions without delay. His subscription to the Popish articles had been publicly made in St. Mary's church, at Oxford. He now, therefore, resolved that his abjuration of them should be pronounced, as publicly, before the face of a Christian assembly. He accordingly on the very next Sunday after his arrival, proclaimed his own weakness, from the pulpit, in language of deep humiliation and bitter self reproach. In a voice almost stifled with sighs and tears, he exclaimed. —“It was my abject and cowardly mind, and faint heart, that made my weak hand commit this wickedness.” He then fervently implored the pardon of Almighty God Whom he had offended, and the forgiveness of the Church which he had dishonoured. The whole congregation were moved, even to weeping, by the passionate expression of his shame and sorrow; and, at once, restored him to his former place in their esteem. There was not one among them who did not, thenceforth, embrace him as a beloved brother, and almost as an angel of God. Perhaps they even valued him still more highly for his ingenuous repentance, than they would have done, if he had never fallen.

“It is an easy thing,” says one of his biographers, “for those who were never tried, to censure the frailty of those that have truckled, for some time, under the shock of a mighty temptation. But let us remember St. Paul's advice, *Let him that standeth, take heed lest he fall.* This great man's fall shall ever be my lesson. And, if this glistening Jewel were thus clouded and foiled,—*God be merciful to me a sinner!*”

Jewel soon after went to Strasburg at the invitation of Peter Martyr, who kept a kind of college of learned men in his house, of which he made Jewel his vice-master. Jewel afterwards attended his friend to Zurich, and assisted him in his theological lectures. He seems also to have travelled to Padua, where he formed an acquaintance with Signior Scipio, a Venetian gentleman, to whom he afterwards addressed a letter concerning the Council of Trent.

Jewel was ever ready to assist and to console his fellow sufferers. "But," as Mr. Le Bas remarks, "the demon of strife descended among the champions of peace and truth. The scenes of their banishment were converted into schools of angry controversy. In the first days of their exile, the brethren, for the most part, dwelled together in unity. But many of them had, unhappily, sought refuge in various places where the genius of Calvin was predominant; and there they gradually imbibed a fondness and an admiration for the mighty works of that Master Builder of the Tower of Confusion. From that moment all concord and harmony was at an end, among the exiled Protestants. The spirit of discord went forth from Geneva, and speedily shed its pernicious influence among the brethren at Frankfort. The English liturgy was the first thing that suffered from the eruption. As early as 1554, the reformers of Frankfort began to tamper with their service-book; and it soon appeared that the beginnings of strife are as when one letteth out water. The proceedings of the malcontents were vehemently encouraged by John Knox, afterwards "the great incendiary of Scotland:" and the effect of his interference was, that, on the 15th of Nov, 1554, the men of Frankfort dispatched to them of Zurich, an open and bitter defiance of the English formularies. The men of Zurich retorted, on the 28th of the same month; and, thenceforward, the debate became fierce and obstinate, and the breach well nigh incurable!

It was in vain that Grindal and Chambers were sent from Strasburgh, for the purpose of allaying these commotions. It was equally in vain that representations were subsequently forwarded, from the whole body of the English at Strasburgh, with the same pious and charitable object. These measures had no other effect, but to drive the innovators to an appeal to the almost pontifical authority of Calvin. His decision, of course, was in favour of the dissentients; and they were thus confirmed in their bitter opposition to the English Ritual. In the following year (1555), some slight advantage was obtained over the Calvinistic party, by the exertions of Dr. Richard Cox, who arrived at Frankfort in March, and succeeded in driving Knox from the place, and re-establishing the Liturgy there. This success, however, was but transitory and insignificant. For, in the ensuing August, Knox and Goodman retired to Geneva, the metropolis of schism, and were followed thither by the main body of the separatists. Under the ministry of these two men, they utterly rejected the whole scheme of the English Reformation, as accomplished in the reign of Edward VI., and professed their entire conformity to the discipline of Geneva. It is well known with what disastrous effect their principles were afterwards imported into England.

At this period, Jewel was with Peter Martyr at Zurich: and it will easily be imagined that no efforts were spared by him to heal these miserable distractions, and to bring back the spirit of peace and unity to the suffering Church. He urgently besought the brethren to remember that they had still one powerful and inveterate enemy to contend against; that their strength must be dissipated, and their cause rendered contemptible, by disunion; and that, by their dissensions, they were doing the work of the papacy almost as effectually as they would by open defection from the truth. He omitted no topic of exhortation or intreaty which might recall them to a sense



of their infatuation. But alas! he was preaching to the tempest. The winds of discord had got loose; and it far exceeded all human power to command them back to their confinement. They continued to rage with unabated fury, and to render the Protestant cause, in the season of its adversity, a spectacle of sorrow to its most faithful followers, and of exultation to its most malignant persecutors.

The 17th of November, 1558, was the happy day of Queen Elizabeth's accession; and in January, 1559, we find Jewel at Strasburg, on his way back to old England.

The wise and cautious proceedings of the queen and her ministers were too slow for the impetuosity of Jewel, still a young man. Nevertheless, we find him writing to Bullinger, in 1559, thus: "At this time we have to contend, not only with our adversaries, but with those of our own friends, who, of late years, have revolted from us, and joined our enemies, and who now oppose us with a bitterness and obstinacy beyond all ordinary hostility. And, what is infinitely more vexatious, we have to struggle against the remnants of the Spanish party; that is, with those foulest of vices, pride, luxury, and licentiousness. Still, we have done, and are doing, what we can. May God prosper our efforts, and give them increase! But at this moment, we live as men who seem scarcely to be returned from banishment. To mention nothing else,—no fragment of that which was their own, has yet been restored to our party. But, although this lingering expectation is painful, we doubt not that all will shortly be well. For we have a wise and religious queen, who is propitiously disposed towards us. Religion has been restored to the same condition, in which it was left by Edward VI.; an event, to which, I am persuaded, your own letters and exhortations, and those of your republic, have powerfully contributed. *The queen is averse from being addressed as Head of the*

*Church of England. She contends that this is a dignity which belongs only to Christ, and is unsuitable to any mortal being; and, further, that all such titles have been so foully contaminated by Antichrist, that they can no longer be used by any pious Christian. Our universities are so depressed and ruined, that there are scarcely two individuals at Oxford who think with us; and even they are so dejected, and broken in spirit, that they can do nothing. So that the contemptible friar, Soto, and a certain Spanish monk, have torn up by the roots all that had been so prosperously planted by Peter Martyr, and have reduced the vineyard of the Lord to a wilderness. You could scarcely believe that such desolation could have been effected in so short a time. So that, although I should be delighted to see even a dog from Zurich, in England, yet can I not recommend that you should, at this time, send your young men to us, for the purpose of literary, or religious education; unless you would receive them back no better than godless and ignorant barbarians."*

He was one of the sixteen divines who, in the preceding March, had been appointed by the queen to hold a disputation in Westminster Abbey against the Papists, which failed by the improper and unaccountable conduct of the Romanizing theologians. He was also in a commission, of which he himself gives the following account:—"There is now a commission ordered for the whole of England, with a view to the establishment of religion. Sandys goes to Lancaster, I to Devonshire, others to other parts:" he adds here again, what it were wished people would constantly bear in mind: "*The queen will not be entitled the Head of the Church; at which I certainly am not displeased.*"

There can be no doubt that the visitation did much towards the recovery of the realm from the state of ignorance and confusion above adverted to by Jewel.

The labours of himself and his colleagues in the commission were eminently serviceable in the establishment of sound religious practices and opinions. Of the whole body of the clergy—prelates, dignitaries, and incumbents—only one hundred and eighty-nine refused compliance with the Reformation. With this exception, all gave in their subscription to a declaration, by which they consented to an abolition of foreign jurisdiction, either in temporal or spiritual matters; to the restoration of the crown of England to its rightful supremacy; and to the administration of the sacraments, and the order of divine service, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. The progress towards a peaceable settlement, however, even at that early period of the queen's reign, was much embarrassed by the scruples, which certain of the most distinguished reformers had brought with them from the continent, touching the lawfulness of clerical habits and religious ceremonies. That Jewel himself was then considerably infected with this fastidious aversion for the decent solemnities of public worship, is beyond all question.

On this one point he was quite childish for a time, evidently supposing that it would cause an alienation between himself and his foreign friends: but afterwards, when he was Bishop of Salisbury, he was very resolute in enforcing an observance of the ecclesiastical habits and the religious ceremonies, refusing, for non-compliance, to permit his friend Humphrey to officiate in his diocese. He evidently thought the subject a matter of indifference, until ordained by proper authority; and he desired the point to be conceded when it was under discussion; but after the order had been made he felt it to be his duty to have it observed. That he had eventually no sympathy with the Puritans is clear, not only from the tone of his writings, but from the hatred with which they persecuted his memory, and, as usual, brought charges against him falsely.



On the 21st of January, 1560, Jewel was consecrated Bishop of Salisbury, and on the 17th of March he appeared in his episcopal habit at St. Paul's Cross, where he preached the celebrated sermon in which he set forth his challenge to the Papists. His text was from 1 Cor. xi. 23, &c.: *For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you; that the Lord Jesus, the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, &c. &c.* In the course of the sermon he speaks of the challenge in question, as something which had been pronounced by him, in substance, on a former occasion; but which he now felt himself called upon to repeat, by certain rumours and surmises, to the effect that he had then given utterance to more than he was prepared to maintain. His words are these: "The matter itself I have now in hand, putteth me in remembrance of certain things that I have uttered unto you to the same purpose, at my last being in this place. I remember I laid out, then, here before you, a number of things that are now in controversy, whereunto our adversaries will not yield. And I said, perhaps boldly, as it might then seem to some men,—but, as I myself, and the learned of our adversaries themselves well know, sincerely and truly,—that none of them that this day stand against us are able, or shall ever be able, to prove against us any one of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by example of the primitive Church, or by the doctors, or by the ancient general councils. Since that time, it hath been reported in other places, that I spake then more than I was able to justify or make good. Howbeit, these reports were only made in corners, and therefore ought the less to trouble me. But if my sayings had been so weak, and might so easily have been reprov'd, I marvel that the parties never yet came to the light, to take the advantage. For my promise was, and that openly before you all, that if any man were able to prove the contrary, I would yield and subscribe to him; and he should

depart with the victory. Loath I am to trouble you with the rehearsal of such things, as I have spoken afore. And yet, because the case so requireth, I shall desire you, that have already heard me, to bear the more with me in this behalf. Better it were to trouble your ears with twice hearing of one thing, than to betray the truth of God.

“The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these:—If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council,—or out of the holy Scriptures of God,—or any one example of the primitive Church,—whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved :

“1. That there was any private mass in the world, at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ ;

“2. Or, that there was any communion ministered unto the people under one kind ;

“3. Or, that the people had their Common Prayers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not ;

“4. Or, that the Bishop of Rome was then called an Universal bishop, or the Head of the Universal Church ;

“5. Or, that the people were then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, carnally, or naturally, in the sacrament ;

“6. Or, that His body is, or may be, in a thousand places, or more, at one time ;

“7. Or, that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head ;

“8. Or, that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour ;

“9. Or, that the sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy ;

“10. Or, that in the sacrament, after the words of

consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shows, without the substance of bread and wine ;

“ 11. Or, that the priest then divided the sacrament into three parts, and afterwards received, himself, all alone ;

“ 12. Or, that whosoever had said that the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance, of Christ's body, had therefore been adjudged for a heretic ;

“ 13. Or, that it was lawful to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses, said in one church, in one day ;

“ 14. Or, that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent that the people might worship them ;

“ 15. Or, that the lay people was then forbidden to read the word of God, in their own tongue :

“ If any man were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by example of the primitive Church ;—I promised then that I would give over, and subscribe unto him.”

Having thus recited the challenge, as originally delivered, he proceeds as follows : “ These words, or the very like, I remember I spake here openly before you all. And these be the things that some men say I have spoken, and cannot justify. But I, for my part, will not only *not* call in any thing that I have said (being well assured of the truth herein,) but also will lay more matter to the same ; that, if they that seek occasion have anything to the contrary, they may have the larger scope to reply against me.

“ Wherefore, besides all that I have said already, I will say further—(and yet nothing so much as might be said)—if any one of our adversaries be able clearly and plainly to prove, by such authority of the Scriptures, the old doctors, and councils, as I have said before :



“16. That it is lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely, and in silence to himself;

“17. Or, that the priest had, then, authority to offer Christ unto His Father;

“18. Or, to communicate and receive the sacrament for another, as they do;

“19. Or, to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man, by means of the mass;

“20. Or, that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people, that the mass, *ex opere operato*,—that is, even for that it is said and done,—is able to remove any part of our sin;

“21. Or, that then any Christian man called the sacrament his *Lord* and *God*;

“22. Or, that the people was then taught to believe that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament, as long as the accidents of bread remain without corruption;

“23. Or, that a mouse, or any worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ, (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught;)

“24. Or, that when Christ said, ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*,’ this word *hoc* pointeth not to the bread, but to an *individuum vagum*, as some of them say;

“25. Or, that the accidents, or forms, or shows, of bread and wine, be the Sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not, rather, the very bread and wine itself;

“26. Or, that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ, that lieth hidden underneath it;

“27. Or, that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience—(these be the highest mysteries and greatest keys of their religion, and without them their doctrines can never be maintained and stand upright;)

“If any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, doctors, or councils, as I have required; as

I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him, and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived."

It should be here observed, that the whole of Jewel's Discourse was, of itself, a sort of challenge to the adherents of the Romish faith; for it treated, copiously and intrepidly, of most of the principal points in controversy between them and the Reformers. But the above distinct and articulate impeachment of the more essential doctrines of Romanism, sounded like a trumpet note of defiance. The echo of it went forth, not only over England, but throughout Europe: and none were more rudely startled by the sound of it, than the fugitive Papists, who had sought an asylum at Louvain, Douay, and St. Omer's. In England, however, no champion appeared, on the instant, to take up the gauntlet, which was then audaciously thrown down. The only immediate effect produced by the challenge was a letter from Dr. Henry Cole, the late dean of St. Paul's. The very day after the sermon, this candid divine addressed the preacher, almost "with bated breath and whispering humbleness;" abjuring altogether the office of a disputant, and protesting that he wrote "with no other intention than to be instructed." To this seemingly courteous application, Jewel of course replied with equal courtesy. But as the correspondence proceeded, the tone of the humble inquirer became more and more sarcastic, intemperate, and disingenuous. At length, Dr. Cole had recourse to a most indefensible proceeding. He dispersed among his own party, a letter which purported to be an answer to one of his antagonist; but without communicating that letter to Jewel himself. On hearing this, Jewel requested Cole to inform him whether or not the paper in circulation was written by him; in order that he (Jewel) might not be discredited by delaying to reply.

To this application Cole was obstinately silent. Upon this, Jewel published another letter, containing a recapitulation of the whole debate between them; and so the matter ended.

Two years afterwards Jewel published his far-famed Apology for the Church of England. It was written in Latin. But an English translation was published soon after its appearance, and another, in 1564, by Ann, one of the six learned daughters of Anthony Cooke and wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, lord-keeper of the privy seal. It was translated also into various modern languages.

Jewel was now embarked on the sea of controversy. His Italian acquaintance, Signor Scipio, before alluded to, attacked the Church of England, because she had no representative at the so called Council of Trent. Jewel replied in a powerful and elaborate epistle, or rather treatise, which forms a fit sequel to the Apology. The substance of this treatise, as given by Le Bas, is as follows:—The bishop observes, that if the absence of English representatives were to be a subject of wonder, there would not very soon be an end of wondering. There would still remain matter to wonder at, in the absence of Presbyter John, and of the three Patriarchs of the East,—namely, those of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria. And not only so; but there were many other nations, who made no appearance at this *general* Synod of all Christendom: for instance, the Armenians, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Moors, the Ethiopians, the Indians. Among these nations there were many baptized Christians, who were ruled by bishops; and yet not a single delegate from those regions was seen at Trent. It would appear indeed, that none of these people ever received a summons from the pope. He was evidently conscious that his ecclesiastical decrees could never lay hold upon them.

Still more astounding was it, that the pontiff should summon to a deliberative assembly, men whom he had



before condemned of heresy, and, without hearing, had openly pronounced *excommunicate*. Was it to be imagined that the English would come to the council, as criminals, to hear nothing but their own arraignment and condemnation.

But further, was England the only stubborn country in Europe? Where, then, were the ambassadors from Denmark, from Sweden, from the princes of Germany, from Switzerland, from the Grisons, from the Hans Towns? Where were the representatives of the realm of Scotland, or the Dukedom of Prussia? Nay, where was the pope himself? Did he remain at Rome, to meditate on the fate of John XXII., who came to the council of Constance 'pope,' but returned 'cardinal.'

And then (supposing it granted that a general council, fitly assembled and righteously conducted, were an effective instrument for the settlement of faith,) how could it be shown that the right to convoke it rested with the Patriarch of Rome, more than with any other patriarch or bishop? In ancient times, the convocation of great ecumenical synods was always held to be a part of the imperial prerogative. And if this rule were correct, to whom can the same power belong now, but to the various kings and princes, who have shared among them the imperial dominion?

It should be further remembered, what had been the character of the popes; more especially of the existing pontiff? Could it be a matter of wonder that we came not to a man of blood, who had murdered one of his own cardinals; or to a dealer in simony, who had notoriously corrupted the conclave? Would it be the part of wisdom to run wilfully into a place infected; or to consult of religion, with the enemies of all religion?

Moreover, in ancient times, attendance on councils was a free and optional thing? Bishops were not then bound, on pain of being stigmatized as contumacious, to abandon their dioceses, for long, painful, and ex-

pensive journeys. Our bishops had, in truth, no time to spare from their own sacred functions. They could not be absent five, six, or seven years, at the bidding of the Bishop of Rome?

But after all, what was the real object of this council? If it were the removal of schism, why was Christendom suffered to remain passive for thirty years together, while the *heresy* of Luther was taking root? The truth, however, was, that the restoration of religion was never in the thoughts of any of the popes. The whole design of the council was, to give permanency to inveterate abuse, and to prop up the sinking credit of the Roman Court. The Protestants, on their part, had nothing to fear from a general synod, if it were free, ingenuous, and apostolic. But, this being a hopeless matter, what was left for the people of England, but to order and purify their own Church, by their own national synods?

Such is the brief outline of Jewel's exposition. What may have been the effect of it upon the mind of his Italian correspondent, we are not informed. It does not appear, however, that the application was renewed, or that any reply was attempted, either by private individuals, or by persons in authority.

The bishop's challenge at St. Paul's Cross, followed as it was, by the Apology, of course, raised up against him a host of adversaries; the most eminent of whom was Harding, (*see his Life.*) Harding was an unprincipled apostate, but a man of considerable abilities. He was first called forth by the challenge pronounced by Jewel from St. Paul's Cross, in the Lent of 1560. The Answer of Harding to that defiance was put forth in January, 1563; and was followed, in about two years and a half, by the bishop's Reply, which appeared in August, 1565, and produced a Rejoinder from Harding. A few months, however, before the publication of this Reply, Harding had been again in the field; for his

principal work, the Confutation of a Book called an Apology for the Church of England, had come forth in April, 1565. The Confutation again gave rise to Jewel's grand performance, the Defence of the Apology, of which the first edition appeared in October, 1567. In the course of the next year, 1568, Harding came forth again with a collection of cavils against the bishop's Defence. To this performance he prefixed the following lengthy and scurrilous title:—"A Detection of sundry foul Errors, Lies, Slanders, Corruptions, and other false Dealings, touching Doctrine, and other Matters, uttered and practised by Mr. Jewel, in a Book lately by him set forth, entitled a Defence of the Apology, &c." The work, however, was not of sufficient importance to demand a distinct publication in answer to it. Jewel accordingly delayed all notice of this "Detection" till the appearance of the second impression of the "Defence." This impression was completed in December, 1569, together with a preface, in which the despicable futility of Harding's "Detection" is calmly, but most triumphantly exposed. The "Defence" at its first publication, was accompanied by an Epistle to the Queen; which, of itself was a sufficient refutation of the falsehoods then circulated by the friends of Harding; namely, that the works of Jewel were published without the royal sanction; and that her majesty was displeased with him for disturbing the world with his controversial writings.

In the year 1565, the university of Oxford, as a reward for his eminent services to the Protestant cause, conferred upon him the degree of doctor of divinity, though he was then absent; and in the following year, he attended Queen Elizabeth in the visit which she made to that seminary, and moderated at the divinity disputations which were then held in the presence of her majesty. Bishop Jewel discharged the duties of his episcopal function with exemplary diligence and attention. In his first visitation he began, and in his last



he perfected, such a reformation, not only in the cathedral and parochial churches, but in all the courts of his jurisdiction, as procured him the veneration and esteem of all good men. Of the manner in which his clergy discharged their duties, and of their moral conduct, he was a vigilant inspector; and, by watching narrowly the proceedings of his chancellor and archdeacons, his stewards and receivers, he guarded against those acts of oppression, injustice, and extortion, for which episcopal courts have been too often justly censured. To prevent these, and other abuses, he often sat in his consistory court; and he also frequently sat as an assistant on the bench of civil justice, being himself in the commission of the peace. He was also a frequent and zealous preacher, often travelling about his diocese, and occupying the pulpit wherever he came. His private life was pious, useful, and laboriously studious. He generally rose about four o'clock in the morning; and, after prayers with his family at five, and in the cathedral about six, retired to his studies during the remainder of the morning. After dinner he gave audience to all persons who had any requests to make to him, or attend to the causes which either devolved upon him in his judicial capacity, or were referred to him as an arbitrator. About nine o'clock at night, he examined his domestics, respecting the manner in which they had spent the day, and then went to prayers with them; after which he returned to the labours of his study, till near midnight, when he went to bed, where the gentleman of his bed-chamber generally read to him till he fell asleep. Such a laborious course of life, without any recreation or intermission, excepting what his necessary refreshment at meals, and a very few hours of rest afforded him, contributed to injure his health, and bring on a decline. When his friends could not but observe a sensible alteration in his appearance, they endeavoured, but without effect, to prevail upon him to

relax from his incessant application, and to desist, at least for a time, from undertaking pulpit services. In reply to their friendly remonstrances he only answered, that “a bishop should die preaching.” These words were almost literally fulfilled in his own case: for a little time before his death, having promised to preach at some place in Wiltshire, on his way thither he was met by a gentleman, who, perceiving from his looks that he was very ill, strongly urged him to return home, telling him that the people had better lose one sermon, than be altogether deprived of such a pastor. The bishop, however, could not be prevailed upon to return, but proceeded to the place appointed, and there preached his last sermon, which he was not able to finish without great difficulty. From that time he grew rapidly worse, and died within a few days, in September, 1571, at Monkton-Farley, in Wiltshire, when he was in the fiftieth year of his age.

The Life of Bishop Jewel has been written by Mr. Le Bas, with his usual vigour of style, and with that sound Church of England feeling for which he is so justly celebrated. He concludes his extracts from the writings of Bishop Jewel, by the following passage from his treatise on the Sacraments; which we adduce, not as containing any thing remarkable for novelty of statement, but as exhibiting the sentiments of one of the most illustrious of our reformers, relative to the nature and effect of the sacrament of baptism.

“I will now speak briefly of the sacraments, in several, and leave all idle and vain questions, and only lay open so much, as is needful and profitable for you to know. *Baptism, therefore, is our regeneration, or new birth,* whereby we are born anew in Christ, and are made sons of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. It is the sacrament of remission of sins, and of that washing we have in the blood of Christ. We are all born the children of wrath, and have our part in the offence of Adam.

For this cause are infants baptized, because they are born in sin, and cannot become spiritual, but by this new birth of the water and the Spirit. They are the heirs of the promise. The covenant of God's favour is made unto them. God said unto Abraham, *I will establish My covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.* Therefore, saith the apostle,—*If the root be holy, so are the branches.* And, again,—*the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean: but now, they are holy.*" When the disciples rebuked those that brought little children to Christ, that he might touch them, he said, *Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.* And, again,—*their angels always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

"The kingdom of heaven is of such, saith Christ; and, not only of those, but of other like infants which shall be in all times.

"As God took the seed of Abraham to be partakers of the covenant which He gave to Abraham, so He appointed that every man child of eight days should be circumcised. May we think that the promise of God hath an end, so that it reacheth not unto our children? Or might the children of the Jews receive the sign of the covenant, and may not the children of Christians? Whatsoever was promised to Abraham, the same is also performed unto us. We enjoy the same blessings and free privileges of God's favour. St. Paul to the Galatians saith, *Know ye, that they which are of faith, are the children of Abraham.* Again,—*If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs by promise.* . . . . The apostles baptized, not only such as professed their belief, but whole households. . . . Infants are a part of the Church of God. They are the sheep of Christ, and



belong to his flock. Why should they not bear the mark of Christ? They have the promise of salvation. Why should they not receive the seal whereby it is confirmed unto them? They are of the number of the faithful. Augustine saith,—‘Where place you young children that are yet unbaptized! Verily in the number of them that believe.’ Why, then, should they not partake of the sacrament, together with the faithful!”

“Baptism,”—he afterwards adds—“is the covenant, and promise of God, which clotheth us with immortality; assureth our resurrection; *by which we receive regeneration*, forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. His word declareth His love towards us; and that word is sealed, and made good by baptism. Our faith, which are baptized, and our continuance in the profession which we have made, establisheth in us this grace which we have received.”

“The water wherein we are baptized doth not cleanse the soul. But *the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, doth cleanse us from all sin*. Not the water, but the blood of Christ, reconcileth us unto God, strengtheneth our conscience, and worketh our redemption. Hereof saith Cyprian,—‘The remission of sins, whether it be given by baptism, or by any other sacraments, *doth properly appertain to the Holy Ghost*. The solemnity of the words, and the invocation of God’s holy name, and the outward signs appointed to the ministry of the priest, by the institution of the apostles, work the visible outward sacrament. But, touching the substance of it, it is *the Holy Ghost that worketh it*.’—St. Ambrose saith—‘Thou hast seen the water; thou hast seen the priest; thou hast seen those things which thou mightest see with the eyes of thy body, and with such sight as man hath. But those things which do the deed of salvation, which no eye can see, thou hast not seen.’”

“Such a change is made in the sacrament of baptism. Through the power of God’s word the water is turned

into blood. They that be washed in it receive remission of sins. Their robes are made clean in the blood of the Lamb. The water itself is nothing. But, by the working of God's Spirit, the death and merits of our Lord and Saviour Christ are, thereby, assured unto us."

"Some make no doubt of those infants, the children of the faithful, which depart before baptism,—whether they be saved or not. What! shall we say that they are damned? It is a hard matter, and too curious for man to enter into the judgments of God. His mercy is infinite, and His purpose secret. He showeth mercy unto those, upon whom He will have mercy: Who can appoint Him, or set Him an order what He shall do? It is not good, nor standeth with Christian reverence, to be contentious and busy in searching out, or reasoning of matters, which the wisdom of God hath hidden from our knowledge. Yet, if any would fain be resolved, he may thus safely reason. It is true that children are born in sin; and, that by the sin of one man, death entered into the world; and that the reward of sin is death. But who knoweth if God hath forgiven them their sin? Who is His counsellor, who knoweth His meaning? Our children are the children of God. He is our God, and the God of our seed. They be under the covenant with us. The soberest way is to speak least; and to leave them to the judgment and mercy of God."

"Howbeit if any should despise, and of wilfulness refuse this holy ordinance, so that they would, in no case, be baptized, or suffer their children to be baptized; this were damnable. Otherwise, the grace of God is not so tied to the ministration of the sacrament, that if any be prevented by death, so that he cannot be received to the fellowship thereof, he should therefore be thought to be damned."

"In baptism, the nature and substance of water doth remain still. And yet it is not *bare* water. It is changed,

and made the sacrament of our *regeneration*. It is water consecrated and made holy by the blood of Christ. They which are washed therein, are not washed with water, but with the blood of the unspotted Lamb. One thing is seen; and another is understood. We see the water; but we understand the blood of Christ. Even so (in the Lord's supper,) we see the bread and wine; but with the eyes of our understanding, we look beyond these creatures. We reach our spiritual senses into heaven, and behold the ransom and price of our salvation."

The following is a list of the writings which have made the name of Bishop Jewel illustrious throughout Europe:—

1. *Exhortatio ad Oxonienses*; the substance of which is printed in Humphrey's Life of Jewel, p. 35. Ed. 1573. 4to. 2. *Exhortatio in Collegio Corp. Christi, sive Concio in Fundatoris Foxi Commemorationem*; Humphrey, p. 45, &c. 3. *Concio in Templo Beatæ Mariæ Virginis*; Oxon. anno 1550, in 1 Pet. iv. 2. Humphr. p. 49. The same in English. Lond. 1586 8vo. 4 *Oratio in Aulâ Coll. C. C.*; being Jewel's Farewell Address, on his Expulsion from the College. Humphr. p. 74, &c. 5. *Epistola ad Scipionem, patritium Venetum, de causis cur Episcopi Angliæ ad Concilium Tridentinum non convenirent*. 1559. Reprinted in the Appendix to Brent's Translation of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent. Lond. 1629. The substance of this Letter is in Fuller's Church History, xvi. 70. 6. Letters between Jewel and Dr. Henry Cole, upon occasion of a Sermon, &c. Lond. 1560. 8vo. 7. Sermons at St. Paul's Cross, on 1 Cor. xi. 23. Anno. 1560: (or, according to Strype, 26 Nov., 1559. See Strype's Grindal, p. 27.) Lond. 1560. 8vo. This was the celebrated Sermon of the *Challenge*.

8. *Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*; Lond. 1562. 8vo. Translated into various European languages:—into English, by Lady Anne Bacon, 1564: into Welsh by M. Kyffin, Oxon. 1571, 8vo. A Greek translation was



published by John Smith of Magd. Coll. Oxon. 1614. 1639. 12mo. 9. A Reply to Mr. Harding's Answer to the Challenge of Bishop Jewel; in twenty-seven Articles, 1565.—Translated into Latin by William Whitaker. Lond. 1578. 10. A Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, against Harding. 1567. Again in 1570, with a Preface, in answer to Harding's "Detection of Sundry Foul Errors, &c."—Translated into Latin by Thomas Bradock of Cambridge, 1600. 11. A View of a Seditious Bull sent into England by Pius V., Bishop of Rome; delivered in certain Sermons in the Cathedral Church of Sarum. 1750. 12. A Treatise of the Holy Scriptures, gathered out of his Sermons at Salisbury. Anno. 1570. Lond. 1582. 8vo. 13. Exposition of the Two Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. Lond. 1594. 8vo. 14. Certain Sermons, preached at St. Paul's Cross, and elsewhere. 1603. 8vo. 15. A Treatise on the Sacraments, gathered out of his Sermons. Lond. 1583. 1603. 8vo. 16. An Epistle, in praise of the Book of Thomas Wylson, on Usury; prefixed to the same book. 17. A Tract, *De Usurâ*. Printed in Humphrey, pp. 217, &c. 18. A Letter, that it is not lawful for a man to marry two sister's successively. Printed in Strype's Parker. App. No xix. 19. *Epistola Simlero*; edited by Colomesius. Lond. 1694. 20. Against Harding, on the Private Mass. Lond. 1578. 4to. 21. Against Mr. Rastal's Return of Untruths. An Answer to certain frivolous Objections against the government of the Church of England. A single sheet. Lond. 1641. 22. Sermon on Psalm lxix. 23. Various Letters; several of which have been printed by Strype, in different parts of his compilations; but the greater number, in the Collection of Records, in the third volume of Burnet's History of the Reformation.

Of these writings, those in the above list, from the number 6 to 15 *inclusive*, were printed in one folio volume, in 1609; with a very imperfect Life of the Bishop, by

Dan. Featly. They were again published, in folio, by John Overal, Lond. 1611.

In addition to the printed works, the following are enumerated in Tanner's *Bibliotheca*, as MSS. left by Jewel:—

1. *Epistolæ quinque Latinæ ad J. Parkhurst, Episc. Norvic.* MSS. Norvic. 2. A Paraphrastical Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the whole year. 3. A Continuate Exposition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. 4. Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. 5. Commentary on the Epistle to St. Peter. 6. *Carmen in obitum Regis Edw. VI.* MS. Bale.

Bishop Tanner has placed among the works of Jewel, a Tract with the following title: "A brief and lamentable consideration of the apparel now used by the Clergy; set out for the instruction of the weak, by a faithful servant of God." This was a short publication, put forth in the year 1566, in answer to the bitter complaints and clamours of the Puritans, relative to the clerical habits, and other alleged abuses. There is no evidence that Jewel was the author of it; though Strype conjectures, from its style, that it must have been written either by him, or by Bishop Cox. See Strype's *Parker*, b. iii. c. xi.; also *Append. No. 49*, where this Tract is printed.—*Fuller. Strype. Wordsworth. Le Bas.*

## JOHNSON, JOHN.

JOHN JOHNSON was born December the 30th, 1662. He was the son of the Rev. Thomas Johnson, vicar of Frindsbury, near Rochester, in Kent, by his wife Mary, the daughter of the Rev. Mr. Francis Drayton, rector of Little Chart, in the same county, within the diocese of Canterbury.

His father having been married about four years died,

leaving this son and one daughter to the care of his wife, with a small estate, which, lying near Canterbury, she settled in that city, where she continued a widow for about sixty years, dying about the 90th year of her age, about two years after the death of her son. She put him to the king's school in that city, where he made such a progress in the learned languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, under Mr. Lovejoy, the then master of the school, that when he was a little more than fifteen years of age, he was sent to St. Mary Magdalen College, in Cambridge, where he was admitted under the tuition of Mr. Turner, a fellow of that house, March 4, 167 $\frac{7}{8}$ . And in Lent term 168 $\frac{1}{2}$ , he took the degree of bachelor of arts, as a member of that college. Soon after he was nominated by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury to a scholarship in Corpus Christi (commonly called Bennet) College, being of the foundation of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, after the Settlement of Reformation under Queen Elizabeth: to which he was admitted April 29, 1682, under the tuition of Mr. Beck, fellow of that house. He took the degree of master of arts, as a member of that college, at the commencement, 1685. Soon after he entered into deacon's orders, and became curate to Mr. Thomas Hardres, at Hardres, near Canterbury. And was ordained priest in King Henry the Seventh's Chapel, Westminster, by Dr. Thos. Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, and dean of that church, Dec. 19, 1686. And July 9, 1687, he was collated to the vicarage of Boughton under the Bleam, by Archbishop Sancroft. And by the same archbishop he was allowed to hold the vicarage of Hernhill, adjoining to Boughton, by sequestration; both of which churches he supplied himself, preaching one part of the day at one church, and the other at the other.

In the year 1689, he married Margaret, daughter of Thomas Jenkin, in the Isle of Thanet. In 1679, he obtained the living of St. John, in the Isle of Thanet,



to which the town of Margate belongs, and soon afterwards was presented to that of Appledore. In 1707, he was inducted to the vicarage of Cranbrook.

Before he left Appledore, he began to discover that learning to the world, (which until this time was little known beyond the diocese where he lived, except to some particular acquaintance,) by printing several tracts. Though his modesty was such, that he would not put his name to them, till they had at least a second edition.

I. The first of these was a Paraphrase with Notes on the Book of Psalms, according to the Translation in the Common Prayer Book, which he published in the year 1706, giving it this title, *Holy David and his old English Translators cleared*; containing 1, Directions for the more devout Use of the Psalms, and a short Historical account of the Translation and translators. 2. The Psalter or Psalms of David after the translation of the great Bible, appointed as they are to be sung or said in churches, with large explanatory notes. 3. A general Defence of this old Translation, in Answer to all the Objections and Cavils that have been raised against it. He chose to vindicate this translation, because the clergy are obliged to give their assent and consent to it, as well as to other parts of the Book of Common Prayer. And in this work he shewed himself to have been a great master both of the Greek and Hebrew languages, especially with regard to the holy Scriptures, and an excellent critic to judge where it may be more proper to follow the translation of the Septuagint, rather than the present Hebrew copies as pointed by the Masorites.

II. The next book which he wrote and published, was the clergyman's *Vade Mecum*, or an account of the ancient and present Church of England, the duties and rights of the clergy, and of their privileges and hardships. Containing full directions relating to ordination, institution, and induction, and most of the difficulties which

they commonly meet with in the discharge of their office. Here he shewed himself to be well skilled in all the laws of this Church, civil and ecclesiastical. And this book was so well received by the public, especially the clergy, that about every third year there was a call for a new impression; for in about fifteen years there were no less than five editions of it, the first edition in the year 1708, and the fifth in the year 1723.

III. After this, in the year 1709, he wrote and published, *The Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, part II., containing the canonical codes of the primitive, universal, Eastern and Western Church, down to the year of our Lord, 787. Done from the original Greek and Latin, omitting no canon, decree, or any part of them that is curious and instructive: with explanatory notes, a large index, and a preface, shewing the usefulness of the work, with some reflections on two books, called *Moderate Non-conformity*, and the *Rights of the Church*. In this second part he shewed himself to be no less skilled in the ecclesiastical laws and discipline of the ancient Church, than in the former he had shewed it in the laws and discipline of his own Church. This book also had a third edition.

IV. In the next year, viz. 1710, he wrote and published the *Propitiatory Oblation in the Holy Eucharist*, truly stated and defended from Scripture and antiquity, and the *Communion Service of the Church of England*, in which some notice is taken of Dr. Hancock's *Answer to Dr. Hickes*. This little piece, as likewise all that he had hitherto published, came out without his name being attached.

V. His chief work upon this subject was published at the beginning of the year 1714, with this title—"The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar unveiled and supported. In which the nature of the Eucharist is explained according to the sentiments of the Christian Church in the four first centuries. Proving that the Eucharist is a proper

material Sacrifice. That it is both eucharistic and propitiatory. That it is to be offered by proper officers. That the Oblation is to be made on a proper Altar. That it is to be consumed by manducation. To which is added, a proof that what our Saviour speaks concerning eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel is principally meant of the Eucharist. With a preparatory epistle to the Lord Bishop of Norwich. Animadversions on Dr. Wise's book, which is called the Christian Eucharist stated. And some Reflections on a stitched book entitled, An Answer to the Exceptions made against the Lord Bishop of Oxford's Charge." To this book he set his name: for he was now so well known, that it was in vain for him to think of concealing himself any longer. And after this his name was also placed before the following editions of his *Vade Mecum*.

VI. This publication involved him in controversy, especially with his successor at Margate, Mr. Lewis. Johnson, however, remained undaunted, and in the beginning of the year 1717, though the printer by mistake, has dated it 1718, he published, "The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar unveiled and supported, in which the nature of the Eucharist is explained according to the sentiments of the Christian Church in the first four centuries, Part II. shewing the Agreement and Disagreement of the Eucharist with the Sacrifices of the Ancients, and the excellency of the former. The great moment of the Eucharist, both as a Feast and a Sacrifice. The necessity of frequent Communion. The unity of the Eucharist. The nature of Excommunication. The primitive Method of Preparation, with Devotions for the Altar."

VII. He next published a very valuable work, entitled, "A Collection of all Ecclesiastical Laws, Canons, Answers, or Rescripts, with other memorials concerning the government, discipline, and worship of the Church of



England, from its first foundation to the conquest, that have been published in the Latin or Saxonie tongues. And all the canons and constitutions ecclesiastical made since the conquest, and before the Reformation, in any national council, or in the provincial synods of Canterbury and York, that have hitherto been published in the Latin tongue. Now first translated into English with explanatory notes, and such glosses from Lyndwood and Athone, as were thought most useful." There are two volumes of this book. The first contains the ecclesiastical laws, &c. from the coming of Augustine, the monk, to the conquest, and the second from the conquest to the Reformation. And if it had pleased God to have spared his life a little longer, he would have published a like collection from the Reformation to this time, much more full and complete than what we have in Bishop Sparrow. But he had scarce begun this, when it pleased God to deprive us of him, and to take him to himself.

He was the author of several tracts, chiefly printed for parochial distribution. And after his death, his daughter Mary, his only surviving child, published his *Primitive Communicant*, together with some sermons and tracts.

He was subjected to some persecution, and much misrepresentation, from his adherence to high-Church principles, but against these he could bear up. Domestic afflictions, though borne with a Christian temper, and with pious submission, told upon his constitution, and he died on the 15th of December, 1725. He was as zealous as a parish priest, as he was indefatigable as a writer.—*Brett.*

JOHNSON, SAMUEL.

SAMUEL JOHNSON, the first president of King's College, in New York, was born at Guilford, in Connecticut.

October 14th, 1696, where he received his primary education. At fourteen years of age he was sent to college at Seagbrook, a strong hold of Puritan theology. Notwithstanding every disadvantage from incompetent tutors and a very defective system of education, his mental progress was rapid. Owing to a schism among the proprietors, the college was in 1717 removed to New Haven, where Mr. Johnson received the degree of M. A., and the trustees chose him and his friend Mr. Brown, to take charge of the institution.

He had always intended, with the concurrence and approbation of his friends, to become a preacher of the gospel; and therefore, at the earnest solicitations of the people at West Haven, but four miles distant from the college, he consented to fix himself there in that station, and was set apart to the ministry, March 20, 1720, in the twenty-fourth year of his age. He had met with much better offers in some respects, but he was not governed by mercenary motives. His grand point in view was to improve his own mind in knowledge, in order to be more useful to mankind; and therefore, for the sake of being so near the college and its library, and his friends Mr. Cutler and Mr. Brown, he gave this place the preference, although it had but little to recommend it; and he was extremely happy in this situation.

Mr. Johnson was always of a serious and devout turn of mind, but averse to every appearance of enthusiasm; and he never could be thoroughly reconciled to the practice of public extempore praying and preaching, which he looked upon as the great engines of enthusiasm. When at college he had conceived an aversion to extempore prayers, by observing the use that was made of them there, and the tendency of this practice to promote self-conceit and spiritual pride. The scholars in his time frequently held private meetings for prayer, and those of them that had acquired something of a talent

at extempore praying could not forbear appearing vain of it; one, in particular, who was allowed to excel in that way, had the vanity frequently to boast of his gifts. On the other hand, some modest young gentlemen, of good sense and fair character, who wanted the assurance to pray in this manner, were discountenanced and despised. Mr. Johnson also could not help frequently observing many familiar, impertinent, and indecent, and sometimes almost blasphemous expressions, that were uttered on these occasions, which were shocking to him, and gave him an early dislike to extempore praying. From such observations he could not avoid making the conclusion, that it would be much better to have our prayers pre-composed, with due care and attention.

In 1715, he happened to meet with Archbishop King's discourse, *On the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*, which confirmed him in his opinion. That excellent writer proved, with an evidence that Mr. Johnson thought but little short of demonstration, that public worship carried on in the extempore way, was wrong and unscriptural: and that pre-conceived, well-composed forms of prayer were infinitely preferable. They show a much greater reverence to the Divine Majesty; and in the use of them there is no occasion to rack our invention in finding what to say, or to exercise our minds in ascertaining the meaning and propriety of what is said, as is necessarily the case in extempore prayers. When a form of prayer is used, we have nothing else to do than to offer up our hearts with our words, which, indeed, is the only proper business of prayer. He had been educated under strong prejudices against the Church of England, of which he knew but very little; but the next year, (1716) the Book of Common Prayer was, for the first time, put into his hands, by one Mr. Smithson, a pious member of the Church, who had lately settled in Guilford. On perusing the



Liturgy, he found that it chiefly consisted of a very judicious collection of sentiments and expressions out of the holy Scriptures; and these he had always revered and loved. This inspection, together with Dr. King's book before-mentioned, caused all his prejudices against the Liturgy of the Church of England entirely to vanish.

Mr. Johnson had, likewise, been always much embarrassed with the rigid Calvinistical doctrines in which he had been from infancy instructed. He thought himself bound to believe them, because everybody else did, and because some sounds in Scripture seemed to favour them: but then as many passages in Scripture appeared, at the same time to be utterly inconsistent with them, he could never be perfectly reconciled to these opinions. When the library came over, and after he and his associates had read and considered the writings of some of the most celebrated divines of the Church of England, and conversed together freely on these subjects, they had the unspeakable satisfaction of being able to remove all their doubts and objections, and of obtaining rest to their minds, which had been long agitated and wearied with the perplexities that attended their inquiries. However, the times were such, that they found it necessary to be very cautious in these matters, and to keep their thoughts much to themselves.

Mr. Johnson had also an early dislike to the independent or congregational form of Church government, in which the people have so much influence. This, as well as extempore prayer, he plainly perceived to be productive of conceitedness and self-sufficiency, and, by natural consequence, of censoriousness and uncharitableness. The discipline was often applied to the mere frailties of nature, or prostituted to the purposes of private revenge, and issued commonly in great animosities, and sometimes in the most virulent separations and schisms. He was of opinion, that such a popular form of ecclesiastical

discipline could not long subsist in such a manner as to answer the main ends of government; but must, from the very nature of it, soon crumble to pieces, especially in a country where every individual seemed to think his own judgment infallible. Observations of this kind prepared him, when he came to read and to understand the nature of episcopal government, to see its reasonableness and the great advantages that attend it.

Such was the state of Mr Johnson's mind when he settled at West Haven. It may, therefore, be well supposed, that it would then have been much more agreeable to him to have been ordained in the episcopal than in the congregational way; and this, he informs us, was really the case. But although he thought it eligible in most circumstances, yet he did not think it necessary, in point of duty, as he was then situated, to conform to the Church. Accordingly he made himself easy, and went on in the prosecution of his studies, and in the discharge of his parochial duties, not appearing to vary from the customs of his country.

Notwithstanding, with regard to his public performances his method was peculiar. As to his prayers, he commonly made use of forms, which he provided for himself in the best manner he could, and chiefly out of the Liturgy of the Church of England. And as to sermons, his practice was to write about one a month, taking time to render the composition as perfect as possible; while he contented himself at other times with carefully reading the sermons of Dr. Barrow, and some other celebrated preachers, minuting down only the heads of their discourses, and expressing the sense of his author in language of his own, as he was able to command it at the time of speaking. In this way while he greatly improved his mind, he acquired a facility of expressing himself on any subject. His composing no more than one sermon a month was by no means the

effect of indolence, or an aversion to business, but merely a regular plan he had formed for rendering himself as useful as possible. The attainments he had hitherto made in literature he now considered in the light of a foundation only, on which he conceived it was his duty to raise the highest improvements he was able to make. Accordingly he pursued his studies with intense application and ardour of mind; not neglecting the classics, mathematics, physics, and metaphysics, yet devoting himself chiefly to divinity, ethics, and history both sacred and profane.

In the course of his inquiries, the doctrines and facts of the primitive Church, among other things, came under his examination. With regard to this subject he consulted freely with his friends above mentioned, who often met together at the college, or at one another's places of abode. The result of these conversations and inquiries was, that they could see but little resemblance of the primitive Church in the discipline and worship that were established among them; and that the Church of England appeared to them in its general constitution, to come the nearest to the purity and perfection of the first ages of Christianity of any Church upon earth.

But those conferences, which had hitherto been so agreeable, began now to be productive of uneasiness and anxiety. These gentlemen became unhappy, on finding themselves in a state so very different, in many respects, and particularly with regard to ecclesiastical government, from that of the primitive Church. How to conduct themselves in this case they could hardly determine. They all loved their country, and were greatly respected by it; being esteemed in point both of moral character and literary accomplishments, the most considerable persons of their years belonging to the colony. It therefore pained them to think of forming conclusions which they knew would be distressing to their friends, and offensive to the country in general.



On considering these things, they resolved to set themselves down to re-examine the subject, being desirous of continuing in their present way, if it could be done with a quiet conscience. They formed a resolution, however, to act honestly and impartially, and to read the best books on both sides of the question. According they carefully compared together what was offered by Hoadly and Calamy in their long controversy on the subject: they put into the opposite scales Sir Peter King's Inquiry and Slater's Original Draught; they then examined Potter on Church Government, to which no answer has been attempted: and Mr. Johnson read several of the earliest and best fathers, in their original languages. The effect was, that from the facts in Scripture, compared with those of the primitive Church, it appeared plain to them that the episcopal government was universally established by the Apostles wherever they propagated Christianity; that through the first order of the ministry, called bishops, the power of the priesthood was to be conveyed from the great Head of the Church; and, although presbyters preached and administered the sacraments, yet that *no act of ordination and government, for several ages, was ever allowed to be lawful, without a bishop at the head of the presbytery.* All this appeared as evident, from the universal testimony of the Church, as the true canon of Scripture itself. It was therefore impossible for them after this inquiry, not to suspect, not only the regularity, but even the lawfulness and validity of their own ordination.

At this period the Church of England had scarcely any existence in Connecticut. There were, indeed, about thirty families at Stratford, chiefly from England, who professed themselves members of it, and who had applied to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for a minister; and that venerable body, in consequence of this application, ordered Mr. Pigot, whom they had taken into their service, to reside

at Stratford for a few months. While he was there, Mr. Johnson waited on him in June, 1722, and in the course of conversation, invited him to make a visit to the college; to which he consented, and appointed the day. Mr. Johnson gave notice of this to his friends, and they agreed to meet him there on that occasion. On the day appointed, they all met at the college; and these gentlemen, in their conversation with Mr. Pigot, did no more than express their charity and veneration for the Church of England; but this was so unexpected, and so agreeable to Mr. Pigot, that he could not forbear giving some hints of it among his people at Stratford.

By this time the frequent meetings, and the great intimacy of these gentlemen, began to be noticed, and became the subject of speculation. Some suspected that they were about to apostatize into Arminianism, which was looked upon as one of the vilest heresies; and others went so far as not only to utter their own suspicions, but to raise and propagate several false reports concerning the principles of these gentlemen. In short, by the commencement following, in the month of September, the whole country was in an alarm, and many people came to West Haven, expecting some strange occurrences.

The trustees of the college, who highly esteemed all the gentlemen, did not doubt but they would be able to clear themselves of every unfavourable suspicion. Accordingly, the day after the commencement, they sent for them, with no other expectation, and with a view of removing the dark apprehensions of the people. They were all requested to meet the trustees in the college library; upon which Mr. Cutler, Mr. Hart, Mr. Eliot, Mr. Whittelsey, Mr. Wetmore, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Brown, made their appearance. The examination was formal; and they were desired from the youngest to the eldest, to declare the true state of the case about which they were questioned. The declaration of some of them was, that they doubted the validity of Presbyterian ordi-

nation; and of the others, that they were fully persuaded of the invalidity of it. The trustees were struck with astonishment, and expressed the utmost grief and concern. They desired that the declaration might be given them in writing; which was accordingly done. In return, the trustees sent them a paper, in which they entreated them to consider the matter again with greater attention, and, if possible, to get over their scruples, or at worst, to desist. This was in September, 1722, and the general assembly was to sit in the October following.

In this interim, Governor Saltonstall, who had an esteem and affection for these gentlemen, was desirous of reclaiming them from their errors, proposed that they and the trustees should meet together, and argue the points in a friendly manner in his presence. They accordingly met and disputed; and he acted the part of a moderator with great candour and politeness.

The debate for a considerable time, was managed with decency by both parties; but it soon appeared, that they did not come together under equal advantages. The subject was in a great measure new to the trustees, who had never much considered, or studied the points in controversy; but, on the other side, the advocates for the Church had weighed and examined them with the utmost care, and were at no loss for answers to every objection. The principal argument that was advanced by the former, was taken from the promiscuous use of the words *bishop* and *presbyter*, in the New Testament. But the latter, in their reply, took notice, that men might wrangle for ever about the meaning of words, and therefore they urged that, in the case before them, the surest and safest way was to have recourse to facts. Now the facts to which they appealed were the evident superintendency of Timothy over the clergy, as well as laity, at Ephesus,—of Titus, in Crete,—of the Angels, in the seven Churches of Asia, &c. That these



facts were rightly stated, was evident, as they contended, from the testimony of the very next writers after the Apostles, and of succeeding writers for several ages, as well as from the authentic history of those times, without exception.

Mr. Johnson ran the parallel, as to matter of evidence, between "the fact of episcopacy, and the facts of infant baptism and the first day sabbath," as the matter appeared from the light of history. He observed to his opponents, that he conceived they were right in their reasonings concerning the two latter points; but that exactly the same reasoning would conclude much more forcibly in favour of the former; and, therefore, if they would be consistent, that they must either *receive Episcopacy, or reject infant baptism and the first day sabbath*. He went on, and declared his full conviction and belief, from every kind of information he could gain, that there never was a time, till latterly, in which, if he had acted in opposition to episcopacy, as Aerius did, he would not have been excommunicated for a heretic and schismatic as Aerius was. He concluded with saying, that he had such a reverence for the sense and practice of the ancient Church, that he could find no way of making himself easy while he neglected to follow it. This defence of episcopacy by Mr. Johnson, exciting some irritating remarks from the other party, Governor Saltonstall put an end to the conference.

Three of the gentlemen who appeared on the side of the Church, although they could repel the arguments of their opponents, yet were not able to withstand the alternate reproaches and entreaties of their friends. At length they were so lucky as to discover some way of getting over their scruples, and they continued in their stations—living to a good old age, eminent in their profession, and much respected by their country. And it has often been observed of them, to their honour, that, amidst all the controversies in which the Church was

engaged during their lives, they never were known to act, or say, or insinuate any thing to her disadvantage.

As to Messrs. Cutler and Brown, (the former president of the college, and the latter a tutor in it,) and Mr. Johnson, they were determined to go forward. They had taken care beforehand, gradually to prepare their friends for the event, and had reconciled them to it, in a great measure, by means of the books which they had put into their hands, and persuaded them to read. Accordingly, after formally resigning their respective places, in a few days they set out for Boston, proposing to embark from thence to England, to obtain holy orders in the Church. Mr. Wetmore followed them in a few months.

When Mr. Johnson took leave of his people, whom he greatly loved, he affectionately told them, that if they could see reason to conform to the Church of England, he would never leave them; but after obtaining such ordination as he thought to be necessary, that he would return to them again in the character of their minister. But, with such an offer they were unable to comply, notwithstanding their esteem for him. He expostulated with them, and urged them seriously to consider the matter. Among other things he said, that they had hitherto professed to admire his preaching, and especially his prayers. And, indeed, his prayers were so much admired by people in general, that it was common for persons belonging to the neighbouring parishes to come to West Haven, on purpose to hear them. Now he told them that his instruction and prayers had all along been taken from the Church of England; and that they ought to be esteemed as much, after this circumstance was known, as they had been before. This declaration greatly surprized them: however, no more than four or five of them could then be reconciled to receive him in the orders of the Church.

After a few days, therefore, he took his final leave of

them, and proceeded on his journey to Boston, in company with Messrs. Cutler and Brown. At Rhode Island and Boston, they were treated with all possible respect by the members of the Church. At Boston they were about to erect a new church, and this was offered to Mr. Cutler. The gentlemen there also engaged a passage for the three associates in a ship that was just ready to sail; and, at their own expense, furnished them with every thing that might be needful or useful to them during the voyage. After spending about a week in Boston, they embarked on the 5th of November.

They arrived in the Downs, after a rough and stormy passage, and landed at Ramsgate on the 15th of December; whence they went the same day to Canterbury. There they were obliged to wait three days for the stage coach; and an opportunity was thus afforded them of seeing the chief curiosities of that ancient and venerable city. The day after their arrival they attended divine service at the cathedral church. Here every thing was new and surprising to them. The magnificence of the building, the solemnity of the service, and the music that attended it, all conspired to fill them with admiration and exquisite pleasure.

They had no introductory letters to any persons in Canterbury; however, on their request they were introduced to the dean, who was the learned and excellent Dr. Stanhope. When they came to the deanery, they sent in word, by the servant, that they were gentlemen from America, come over for holy orders, who were desirous of paying their respects to the dean. The dean himself came immediately to the door, took them by the hand, and to their surprise said, "Come in gentlemen; you are very welcome. I know you well; for we have just been reading your declaration for the Church." It seems the declaration, with their names annexed to it, had got into the London papers; and the dean, with a number of prebendaries who dined with him, were at that instant



reading it. The company treated them with great friendship and respect, and desired to hear from them their whole story. This was circumstantially told, and the evening was spent agreeably on both sides.

The next day the dean, who was then to set out for London, took his leave of them for the present, giving them his advice and direction; and afterwards he did them many kind offices, as he had opportunity. While they continued in Canterbury, they were happy in the notice and friendship of the sub-dean, Mr. Gostlin, and of the prebendaries, especially Dr. Grandorge, who was chaplain to the Earl of Thanet. This gentleman, some months afterwards, meeting them in London, took them to his lodgings, and counted out to each of them ten guineas, which was a present from the earl, his patron, for the purchase of books; and afterwards he procured from his lordship forty pounds more for Mr. Cutler's church.

On coming to London, they were received with all possible kindness by Dr. Robinson, the Bishop of London, and by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel: and it was readily agreed, that Mr. Cutler should be sent to the new church in Boston; Mr. Brown to Bristol, in New England, a mission that was vacant; and Mr. Johnson to Stratford; and that Mr. Pigot should be fixed at Providence. The two Archbishops, Dr. Wake and Sir William Dawes; the latter especially, received them with parental affection. Many gentlemen were fond of commencing an acquaintance with them, particularly Dr. King, Master of the Charter House; Dr. Astry, the treasurer of St. Paul's; Dr. Berriman, then Chaplain to the Bishop of London; and the chaplain's brother, Mr. John Berriman, a most worthy clergyman. With them Mr. Johnson afterwards maintained a long and friendly correspondence by letters, but more especially with Dr. Astry and Mr. Berriman.

While the three candidates were preparing for ordi-

nation, and going on with great despatch, Mr. Cutler was taken ill of the small-pox, and had it severely; but by God's goodness he recovered. This caused their ordination to be deferred till the latter end of March, when, by letters dimissory from the Bishop of London, (Dr. Robinson, near the point of death,) to Dr. Green, then Bishop of Norwich, and rector of St. Martin's, they were ordained by the latter, first deacons, and then priests, in St. Martin's Church. They now proposed shortly to make a visit to Oxford. But within a week, Mr. Brown was seized with the small-pox, which proved fatal to him. He expired on Easter Eve, to the great loss of the Church, and the inexpressible grief of his two friends, especially of Mr. Johnson. He was universally allowed by all competent judges, to be one of the most promising young men that his country had ever produced.

In the beginning of May, Mr. Cutler and Mr. Johnson, in prosecution of their former intentions, went to Oxford. On their arrival, they found that their friend Dr. Astry, had procured from the university the degree of doctor in divinity for Mr. Cutler, and that of master of arts for Mr. Johnson, and that the diplomas were prepared: these were respectfully presented to them by Dr. Shippen, the vice-chancellor. The kindness and politeness with which they were treated by the heads and fellows of the houses in general, exceeded their highest expectations. These gentlemen all seemed to study what could be done to increase the happiness of these American visitants. On this occasion, Dr. Delaune, president of St. John's College, and Dr. John Burton, fellow of Corpus Christi, with whom Mr. Johnson afterwards held a correspondence, particularly distinguished themselves by their acts of friendship.

After spending a most delightful fortnight at Oxford, Dr. Cutler and Mr. Johnson returned to London; and, in the beginning of June, they made a visit to the univer-

sity of Cambridge, where Dr. Snape was vice-chancellor, and where they were admitted to the same degrees, and treated in the same respectful manner as at Oxford. Mr. Wetmore, who had lately arrived in England, accompanied them in this tour. After spending a fortnight at this university, they came back to the metropolis. The remainder of the time, before their embarkation for America, was employed in conversing with their friends, in seeing the curiosities in and about London, and in making short excursions to Windsor, Hampton Court, Greenwich, &c. &c.

They received their letters of license from Bishop Gibson, who, by this time, had been translated from Lincoln to London. With this learned and excellent prelate they conversed frequently, on the state of the Church in the colonies. They urged the necessity, as they had repeatedly done with their friends in London, and at both the universities, of sending bishops to America; representing it as, in their humble opinion, a dishonour to the Christian and Episcopal nation of England, that America, which had been planted for one hundred years, and contained a large number of Episcopal congregations, should still be without some of the most important offices of the Church, for want of an episcopate. His lordship was of the same opinion with them; and the next year, on occasion of the Jacobites sending two bishops over to the colonies, he entered warmly into the affair; but he could not prevail with the ministry to give his proposal the attention it deserved. He continued to be zealous for such an establishment as long as he lived; and condescended, in many kind letters, to correspond with Mr. Johnson, on that and other subjects relating to the Church.

Taking leave of their friends in London, Dr. Cutler and Mr. Johnson embarked for America on the 26th of July; and after a pleasant passage, landed at Piscataqua; whence they proceeded directly to Boston. On the 4th



of November, 1723, Mr. Johnson arrived at his mission in Stratford, and was joyfully received by his little flock. Mr. Pigot then hastened to his charge at Providence.

On his return to his native country, Johnson officiated at Stratford, in the neighbourhood of his former residence, West Haven; having to undergo not a little persecution. In spite of all difficulties, he persevered, by his preaching and writing, vindicating the Church. In 1743, the university of Oxford conferred upon him, by diploma, the degree of D.D. In 1754, the trustees unanimously chose Dr. Johnson, president of the college of New York, a situation which he resigned in 1763, having discharged its duties with honour to himself, and with benefit to the public. He returned to Stratford, where he resumed his clerical duties, and was much in correspondence with Archbishop Secker, and other prelates in England, on the subject of establishing Episcopacy in America. It is unnecessary to say, that their exertions were in vain. The mother country refused the blessing which republican America obtained immediately after its independence was established. Dr. Johnson died, universally beloved and respected, in 1772.

His chief works are:—A Dissertation on the Reasonableness, Usefulness, and Duty of Prayer; and, A Sermon on the Beauty of Holiness in the Worship of the Church of England, being a brief Rationale of the Liturgy.—*Chandler.*

## JONAS, JUSTUS.

JUSTUS JONAS was born at Northansen, in Thuringia, on the 5th of June, 1493. He first applied himself to the study of law, but afterwards devoted himself to Lutheran theology, and became one of its most distinguished professors. In 1521, he was nominated principal of the college of Wittemberg. He assisted at several conferences

of the clergy, and attended Melancthon to the celebrated conference at Marburg. In 1539, he assisted Luther in reforming the Churches of Misnia and Thuringia, and removing to Halle, became superintendent of the Churches in that district. He attended Luther in his last illness, and preached his funeral sermon. He was appointed pastor of the church of Eichfeldt, and superintendent of the Churches in the district of Coburg. He died at Eichfeldt, in 1555, when about sixty-three years of age. He was the author of:—Notes on the Acts of the Apostles; A Treatise in Defence of the Marriage of Priests; A Discourse on Theological Studies; and translations of different works of Luther from the Latin into the German language.—*Moreri*.

#### JONES, WILLIAM.

JONES of Nayland, as he is commonly called, was born at Lowick, in Northamptonshire, on the 30th of July, 1726. He was educated at the Charter House, and on a Charter House exhibition, went to University College, Oxford. There he addicted himself to Mr. Hutchinson's philosophy, and partially adopted his principles. He formed a friendship with Bishop Horne, which lasted through life. (*See the Life of Horne.*)

Mr. Jones was admitted to the degree of B.A., in the year 1749, and soon afterwards received deacon's orders from the Bishop of Peterborough. In 1751, he was ordained priest by the Bishop of Lincoln, and on quitting the university became curate of Finedon, in Northamptonshire. While he was in this situation, he published, in 1763, his "Full Answer to Bishop Clayton's Essay on the Spirit," or rather the essay which that heretical prelate disingenuously adopted. (*See Life of Clayton.*) The refutation was triumphant and complete. He mar-

ried in 1754, and went to reside at Wadenho, as curate to his brother, the Rev. Brook Bridges. Here he drew up *The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity*, which he had kept in his thoughts for some years, and to which he had paid particular attention as often as the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament were before him. It is an invaluable work, and admirably calculated to stop the mouths of gainsayers; "which compareth spiritual things with spiritual," and maketh the Scripture its own interpreter. To the third edition, in 1767, was added, *A Letter to the Common People in answer to some popular Arguments against the Trinity*. The Society for promoting Christian Knowledge have since laudably admitted it into their list of books, and from the general distribution of it, there can be no doubt of its producing great and good effects.

Here also he engaged in a course of experiments, necessary to his composing a treatise on philosophy, in elucidation of his favourite system; and met with liberal friends, who, by a subscription among themselves of three hundred pounds per annum for three years, enabled him to furnish himself with such an apparatus as he wanted. The result of his labours was, "An Essay on the first Principles of Natural Philosophy," published in 1762, quarto, intended to demonstrate the use of natural means, or second causes, in the economy of the material world, from reason, experiments, and the testimony of antiquity. It was designed as a preparatory work, to obviate the objections against the system for which he was an advocate, founded on the Newtonian philosophy; and it displayed considerable learning and ingenuity, as well as an ardent attachment to the interests of piety and virtue, united with the eccentric peculiarities of the Hutchinsonian school.

In the year 1764, Archbishop Secker presented Mr. Jones to the vicarage of Bethersden, in Kent, whither he removed with his family; and when he afterwards



found that the income of his benefice was not equal to what he expected, in pursuance of the advice of his friends, he undertook the tuition of a few pupils. For such an office he was well qualified by his skill in the learned languages, his various knowledge, his great industry, and his perspicuous easy manner of communicating instruction. In the year 1765, Archbishop Secker presented Mr. Jones to the rectory of Pluckley, in the same country, where he took up his residence, and continued his plan of education, pursuing at the same time his course of philosophical experiments, as well as theological studies, and discharging his pastoral duties with exemplary zeal and diligence. In the year 1769, he published a letter to "A Young Gentleman at Oxford, intended for holy orders, containing some seasonable cautions against errors in doctrine," octavo; consisting chiefly of the substance of a visitation sermon preached before Archbishop Secker, in 1766. His subsequent publications during his continuance at Pluckley, were, some remarks on the principles and spirit of "The Confessional," annexed to a new edition of his "Answer to an Essay on Spirit," &c. 1770, octavo; "Zoologia Ethica; a Disquisition concerning the Mosaic Distinction of Animals, clean and unclean; being an Attempt to explain to Christians the Wisdom, Morality, and Use of that Institution, in two parts," 1772, octavo; "Three Dissertations on Life and Death," 1772, octavo; a volume of "Disquisitions on some select Subjects of Scripture," which had been before separately printed, 1773, octavo; and "Reflections on the Growth of Heathenism among Christians, in a Letter to a Friend at Oxford, by a Presbyter of the Church of England." 1776. 8vo.

During his residence at Pluckley, which was upwards of twelve years, he carried on his philosophical work with his usual ardour; he taught his pupils learning by instruction, and virtue by example: and in his attention to the flock of which he was overseer, pursuing the plan

he had adopted at Wadenho, he was a watchful shepherd ; “in the day the drought consumed him, and the frost by night, and sleep departed from his eyes.”

But “man continueth not in one stay.” The good rector was induced to remove from Pluckley, and accepting the perpetual curacy of Nayland in Suffolk, he went thither to reside with his family. Soon after he effected an exchange of Pluckley for Paston in Northamptonshire, which he visited annually; but he set up his staff at Nayland for the remainder of his days, not being “led into temptation” ever to quit that post by any future offer of preferment. It was matter of surprise to many, that he, who “laboured more abundantly than they all,” (which might be said without disparagement to any) should have been so miserably neglected, and that so much merit should meet with so little reward.

The Physiological Disquisitions before alluded to, having received their last revise, were printed in 1781. His next publication was his admirable Lectures on the Figurative Language of the Holy Scripture, and the Interpretation of it from the Scripture itself. After the example of his blessed Master, the minister of Nayland was ever anxious to receive little children under his care, and “train them up in the way wherein they should go.” He well knew how to adapt his instruction to the understanding of his young disciples, and took peculiar pleasure in the exercise of this branch of his pastoral office.—“Feed my lambs.”—He taught them privately at his own home, and publicly in the Church; and his catechetical lectures, which were plain, and adapted to the capacities of the children, were admirably calculated for the edification of those of riper years. And whereas didactic discourses are for the most part dry and tedious, he had the successful art of engaging attention by making them animated and interesting. Having been long persuaded of the great importance of uniformity in worship among Christians, and having

observed the many evil consequences of nonconformity, he was particularly careful to instruct his young pupils in the nature of the Church, and convince them betimes of the heinousness of the sin of schism. In the preface to his *Essay on the Church*, printed in 1787, and since admitted, on the motion of Bishop Horsley, (than whom no man could better estimate its merits and its usefulness) at a meeting of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, into their list of books, he says, he was led to the subject by the accident of his being at that time the only Sunday schoolmaster in the place. A fortunate accident for the parish and the public, that gave rise to so excellent a treatise! And though there is no reason that the minister of the parish should himself be the Sunday schoolmaster; it were to be wished that all such schools were under his inspection and management. For as it pleases God, in the course of his dispensations, to bring good out of evil, so it is the province of the adversary of mankind to bring evil out of good, and there is much cause to apprehend, that without great circumspection on the part of our governors in Church and State, the institution of Sunday schools, considered at first with satisfaction as a step to national reformation, will be made subservient to the purpose of schism and sedition—"and what was intended for our welfare be an occasion of falling." In his little volume, called the *Book of Nature*, this diligent "instructor of babes" teaches them in the most pleasing and convincing manner, in a new language, as it were, by things instead of words, to "know the Scriptures, which are able to make them wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus;" and in the *Churchman's Catechism*, he prepares them to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," by giving them just notions of the Christian Church, and instilling into their tender minds the necessity of continuing in its communion for the preservation of that charity, which is the end of the commandment.



A doctrine, the more earnestly to be insisted on in these days of wild disorder and confusion, when schism is accounted no sin, and to "hear the Church," no duty. However *spiritual* some may think themselves, in separating from the Church, or in causing divisions in it, the apostle declares they are *carnal*: "For whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not *carnal*, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not *carnal*?" And let it be remembered, that Satan is no less Satan, when "transformed into an angel of light," than when he appears in his own proper character.

In 1790, by the advice of his friend Bishop Horne, he published two volumes of Sermons on Moral and Religious subjects; and in 1792, his Letter of Thomas Bull to his brother John. He originated the British Critic, which, having done some service to the Church, fell at last into bad hands, and in our days died a disgraceful death. He also published a Collection of Tracts, by Charles Leslie, Mr. Law, Mr. Norris, Roger North, Bishop Horne, &c., in two volumes 8vo., under the title of "The Scholar armed against the Errors of the Time; or, a Collection of Tracts on the Principles and Evidence of Christianity, the Constitution of Church, and Authority of Civil Government."

During the year last mentioned, Mr. Jones met with a severe loss in the death of his intimate friend Bishop Horne, to whom he was chaplain, and whose life he undertook the task of recording. This work made its appearance in the year 1795, entitled, "Memoirs of the Life, Studies, and Writings of the Right Rev. George Horne, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Norwich." 8vo. He now was become advanced in age, and was obliged by his infirmities to discontinue his practice of taking pupils. That he might not be subjected to any inconvenience from the diminution of his income which was thus created, in the year 1798 the Archbishop of Canter-

bury benevolently presented him to the sinecure rectory of Hollingbourn in Kent; which, however, he did not live long to enjoy. The last publication which he sent into the world was "A Discourse on the Use and Intention of some remarkable Passages of the Scriptures, not commonly understood: addressed to the readers of a Course of Lectures on the Figurative Language of the Holy Scriptures." 1799. 8vo. Soon after this, he sustained a heavy loss by the death of his wife, which plunged him in deep affliction; and that trial was in a short time followed by a paralytic attack, which deprived him of the use of one side. His faculties, however, remained uninjured, and he speedily recovered so far as to be able to walk with a stick, and to write. In this infirm state of body he lived some months, and at length expired without a sigh or a groan, February 6th, 1800, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

Besides the works enumerated in the preceding narrative, he composed a Morning and Evening Cathedral Service; ten Church pieces for the Organ: and four Anthems in score, for the Church of Nayland. His works, including his Occasional Tracts, have been published in six vols. 8vo., by William Stevens, Esq., with the life of the author prefixed, from which this article has been abbreviated.

#### JORTIN, JOHN.

JOHN JORTIN was born in London, the 23rd of October, 1698, and was educated at the Charter House. In May, 1715, he was admitted of Jesus College, in Cambridge; and, about two years after, was recommended by his tutor, Dr. Styan Thirlby, who was very fond of him, and always retained a friendship for him, to make extracts from Eustathius, for the use of Pope's Homer. He was not directly employed by Pope; nor did it ever happen

to him to see the face of that poet ; for, being of a shy, modest nature, he felt no impulse to force his way to him ; nor did the other make inquiry about him, though perfectly satisfied with what he had done for him.

He took a bachelor of arts degree in January, 1718-19, and a master's in 1772 : he had been chosen fellow of his college soon after the taking of his first degree. This year he distinguished himself by the publication of a few Latin poems, entitled *Lusus Poetici*, which were well received. September, 1723, he entered into deacon's orders, and into priest's the June following. January, 1726-7, he was presented by his college to Swavesey, near Cambridge ; but marrying a daughter of Mr. Chibnall, of Newport Pagnell, Bucks, in 1728, he resigned that living, and soon after settled himself in London.

In this town he spent the next two-and-thirty years of his life ; for though the Earl of Winchelsea gave him the living of Eastwell, in Kent, where he resided a short time ; yet he very soon quitted it, and returned to London. Here for many years he had employment as a preacher in several chapels ; with the emoluments of which, and a decent competency of his own, he supported himself and his family in a respectable though private manner, dividing his leisure hours between his books and his friends, expecially those of the *literati*, with whom he kept up a close and intimate connection.

In 1730, he published four Sermons on the Truth of the Christian Religion ; the substance of which was afterwards incorporated in a work of his, entitled *Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion* ; printed in 1746, 8vo.

In 1731, he published *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, ancient and modern*, in two volumes, 8vo. This is a collection of critical remarks, of which however, he was not the sole, though the principal, author : Pearce, Mason, and others, were contributors to it. In 1751, Archbishop Herring gave him, unasked, the living of



St. Dunstan in the East, London. This prelate, with whom he had been long acquainted, had entertained a high and affectionate regard for him; had endeavoured aforetime to serve him in many instances, with others; and afterwards, in 1755, conferred upon him the degree of doctor of divinity. The same year, 1751, came out his first volume of *Remarks upon Ecclesiastical History*. This work was inscribed to the Earl of Burlington, by whom, as trustee for the Boylean Lecture, he had, through the application of Archbishop Herring and Bishop Sherlock, been appointed in 1749, to preach that Lecture.

These remarks on *Ecclesiastical History*, were continued in four succeeding volumes, down to the year 1517; two published by himself in 1752 and 1754, and two after his death, in 1773. In this work, he shews the temper of Gibbon,—a sarcastical and sceptical turn of mind, insinuating doubts by a sneer, when he could not openly deny a fact, and displaying throughout a spirit of irreverence.

Mr. Dowling says, The *Remarks of Jortin* “are a vulgar caricature, distinguished not more for their heartlessness and absence of every noble feeling, than for the author’s shameful ignorance on the subject he presumed to handle.” He was a scholar rather than a divine. But these were circumstances which recommended him to the favour of the age in which he lived. In 1755, he published six *Dissertations upon different subjects*, in 8vo. The sixth *Dissertation* is on the state of the dead, as described by Homer and Virgil; and the remarks in this, tending to establish the great antiquity of the doctrine of a future state, interfered with Dr. Warburton, in his *Divine Legation of Moses*, and drew upon him a very severe attack from that quarter. He made no reply; but in his *Adversaria* the following memorandum is found, which shows that he did not oppose the notions of other men from any spirit of envy or opposition, but

from a full persuasion that the real matter of fact was as he had represented it. "I have examined," says he, "the state of the dead as described by Homer and Virgil, and upon that Dissertation I am willing to stake all the little credit that I have as a critic and a philologist. I have there observed, that Homer was not the inventor of the fabulous histories of the gods: he had those stories, and also the doctrine of a future state, from old traditions. Many notions of the Pagans, which came from tradition, are considered by Barrow, *Serm. VIII. Vol. II.*, in which sermon the existence of God is proved from universal consent. See also *Bibl. Chois. I. 356.* and *Bibl. Univ. IV. 433.*"

In 1758, came out his *Life of Erasmus*, in one volume, quarto; and in 1760, another volume, quarto, containing *Remarks upon the Works of Erasmus*, and an *Appendix of Extracts from Erasmus*, and other writers. In his preface to the former volume, he says, that "Le Clerc, while he published the works of Erasmus at Leyden, drew up his *Life* in French, collected principally from his *Letters*, and inserted it into the *Bibliothèque Choisie*; that as this *Life* was favourably received by the public, he had taken it as a ground-work to build upon; and had translated it, not superstitiously and closely, but with much freedom, and with more attention to things than to words; but that he had made continual additions, not only with relation to the history of those days, but to the *Life of Erasmus*; especially where Le Clerc grew more remiss, either wearied with the task, or called off from these to other labours." After mentioning a few other matters to his readers, he turns his discourse to his friends; "recommending himself to their favour, whilst he is with them, and his name when he is gone hence; and entreating them in a wish, that he may pass the evening of a studious and unambitious life in a humble but not slothful obscurity;

and never forfeit the kind continuance of their accustomed approbation."

But whatever he or his friends might wish, he was to live hereafter neither so studiously nor so obscurely as his imagination had figured out to him: more public scenes than any he had been engaged in still awaited him. For Dr. Hayter, Bishop of London, with whom by the way, he had always been upon intimate terms, dying in 1762; and Dr. Osbaldeston, who was also his friend, succeeding to that see; he was made domestic chaplain to this bishop in March, admitted into a prebend of St. Paul's the same month, and in October presented to the living of Kensington, whither he went to reside soon after.

In 1764, he was appointed Archdeacon of London, and might have had the rectory of St. James, Westminster, but he chose rather to continue at Kensington, that being a situation he much liked, and better adapted to his then advanced age. Here he lived, occupied (when his pastoral functions permitted) amongst his books, and enjoying himself with his usual serenity, till the 27th of August, 1770, when, being seized with a disorder in his breast and lungs, he grew continually worse, notwithstanding all assistance; and without undergoing much pain in the course of his illness, or losing his understanding in the least, died the 5th of September, in the seventy-second year of his age. He was buried in the new church-yard at Kensington, as he had directed; and had a flat stone laid over him, with this inscription, dictated by himself:

JOANNES JORTIN,

Mortalis esse desiit

Anno Salutis 1770,

Ætatis 72.

He left a widow and two children: Rogers Jortin, of Lincoln's Inn, in the profession of the law; and Martha,



married to the Rev. Samuel Darby, late fellow of Jesus College, in Cambridge, and afterwards rector of Whatfield, in Suffolk.

Besides his principal works, which have already been mentioned, and his Sermons and Charges, there are some things of a smaller kind: as Remarks upon Spencer's Poems, 1734, 8vo., at the end of which are some Remarks upon Milton; Remarks on L. Annæus Seneca, printed in The Present State of the Republic of Letters, for August, 1734; a Sermon, preached at the Consecration of Pearce, Bishop of Bangor, in 1747; a few Remarks on Tillotson's Sermons, given to his friend Dr. Birch, and printed in the Appendix to Birch's Life of that prelate, in 1752; Letter to Avison, concerning the Music of the Ancients, subjoined to a second edition of Avison's Essay on Musical Expression, in 1753; and a few Remarks on Philip's Life of Cardinal Pole, printed in an Appendix to Neve's Animadversions upon that history, 1766.—*Disney's Life prefixed to Jortin's Sermons. Dowling.*

#### JOUVANCEY, JOSEPH DE.

JOSEPH DE JOUVANCEY, a celebrated French Jesuit, was born at Paris, on the 14th September, 1643. He entered the society at the age of 16, and professed rhetoric, first at Caen, then at la Fleche, and finally in the college of Louis XIV., at Paris, with a reputation which time has not diminished.

His superiors called him to Rome, in 1699, to work at the continuation of the History of the Jesuits; and he died in that city on the 29th of May, 1719, aged 76 years. Jouvancey was well versed in the knowledge of ancient authors, whom he often equalled in the precision and elegance of his style. As an orator, a poet, a critic, and a grammarian, no one, says the Abbè d'Olivet, can

be compared with him since the revival of literature, except Mofée and Muret. His chief theological works are: 1st, "Novus apparatus Græco-Latinus cum interpretatione Gallica," Paris, 1681, 4to. 2nd, "Historiæ societatis Jesu pars quinta, tom. posterior ab anno Christi, 1591, ad ann. 1616," Rome, 1710, fol.

This volume is very rare in France, having been suppressed by two decrees of the parliament of Paris, between the 22nd of February and the 24th of March, 1713, as containing pernicious sentiments contrary to the rights of kings.

Jouvancey was accused of having spoken ill of the president, Archilles de Harley, of having said that the law which banished the Jesuits from the kingdom had been unfounded, and finally, of having praised father Guignard, condemned to death, for having had some connection with Jean Chatel. These reproaches are thought to have been exaggerated. Jouvancey, writing from Rome and under the eye of his superiors, may possibly have yielded to their influence, but in seeking to weaken the imputations which were thrown on his brethren, he was not carried beyond the bounds of his duty as a Frenchman and an historian. To prove this it is sufficient to read the *Recueil de Pieces*, published on that occasion, by one of the adversaries of the society.—*Weiss*.

#### JOVINIAN.

JOVINIAN, a heretic of the fourth century, assumed the monastic habit at Milan, and lived at first in strict accordance with it; but soon afterwards becoming tired of the austerity he left his convent and went to Rome. Seduced by the gaities of this city, he soon gave himself up to its pleasures; and in order to justify his change of conduct in the eyes of the public, and perhaps in

his own, he began to dogmatize. He asserted that good living and fasting were matters of indifference, that the state of celibacy was not more perfect than that of marriage, &c. St. Augustine says that Jovinian agreed with the Stoics on the equality of sins. So convenient a doctrine, preached with a kind of natural talent, which he possessed, gained him many partizans.

St. Pammaque, and others of the laity, zealous for the faith, and indignant at the scandal which these new apostles caused, spoke against the works of Jovinian to the Pope Siricius, who, having assembled his clergy, in 390, excommunicated the heretic, as well as eight of his principal adherents. They sought refuge in Milan, where St. Ambrose condemned them afresh. St. Jerome wrote against Jovinian. In his book he praises voluntary celibacy so highly, that it was supposed that he intended to condemn marriage. It was complained of, and he pointed out that his expressions had been wrongly interpreted. Barbeyrec reproaches him wrongfully for having contradicted himself. — *Pillet.*

## JUDAH, LEO.

JUDAH (LEO) was born at Alsace, in the year 1482. The Jesuit Gretser and some other writers, misled by his name have thought him to be a Jew. He evinced a great talent for the Hebrew tongue, and for the sciences, and gave himself up to deep study which soon made him more learned than his contemporaries. He then took the ecclesiastical habit. He was the fellow-student of Zuinglius, and formed a friendship with him at Basle, and was ever afterwards his most faithful and intrepid companion. From the studies they pursued together they derived mutual instruction. Leo succeeded his friend in the Church of Notre Dame des Ermites,



and was afterwards his associate in Zurich. He entered zealously into his ideas of Reformation, and contributed a great deal to spread and propagate them. They both appeared at the second Conference of Zurich, where they replied to all those who defended the worship of images and the celebration of mass as a sacrifice. Judah died in Switzerland, in 1542, aged 60 years. He made a translation of the greater part of the Old Testament from the Hebrew Text, and also of the New, from the Greek. It was completed by Bibliander and Peter Cholin, and reviewed by Pelli-canus. The first edition was in 1543, at Zurich. Robert Estienne reprinted it at Paris, with the Vulgate, in 1545, without naming the author. This edition is usually called the Bible of Vatablus. The Notes which are joined to these two translations are bitterly censured by the Sorbonne, but the theologians of Salamanca were more favourable to them. Ferdinand of Escalante, a Spanish monk, was so charmed with the moderation which is shown in the Preface to this Bible, that he gave the greatest praises to the authors, and especially to Leo Judah, whom he believed to be the Bishop of Zurich, because he is there called "Episcopus Tigurinus;" he also reprinted the Bible, verbatim, with the exception of some slight alterations. This translation stands midway between those that are too literal, and those which are too much paraphrased. The author promised it in the preface, and has well kept his word.

There are however some places in which a little more precision would be desirable. In wishing to shew too much elegance in his style, Leo Judah is sometimes carried beyond the strict sense. Although much attached to the reformed opinions, and professing to follow the original, he did not neglect the ancient versions of Scripture, and has preserved some expressions consecrated by the use of the Church. Genebrard has criticised this version too severely, but Richard Simon has perhaps

spoken of it too much in the contrary way. He says, however, (page 291) "Although the Latin version of Zurich is very praise-worthy, it is not without defects." Erasmus, by a letter circulated among his friends, which was directed against a pamphlet of Leo Judah's, succeeded in irritating him afresh, and exciting him to compose a new pamphlet in the German language, more violent than the first, and accompanied by a letter which provoked him to combat. Erasmus remained silent, and it is from him that we learn these particulars. When the Bible of Leo Judah appeared for the first time at Zurich, Luther is said to have given way to such an excess of joy, that, as Bossuet says, his passions had never before been so violent. The Bishop of Meaux, in relating this fact, has fallen into the error of Gretser, for he calls Leo Judah "the famous Jew who embraced the sect of the Zuinglians."—*Labouderie*.

## JUENNIN, GASPARD.

GASPARD JUENNIN, a priest of the oratory, was born in 1650, at Varembon, in Bresse, and entered the oratory in 1674. After having professed literature, philosophy and theology in several houses of the congregation, he was called to hold conferences of theology in the Seminary of St. Magloire, Paris, where he died in 1713, leaving behind him a great reputation for piety and theological science. His works are: 1. "Commentarius Historicus et dogmaticus de sacramentis," 2 vols. fol. Lyons, 1696 and 1705. This commentary is followed by three Dissertations on censures, irregularities, and indulgences. It is the first work of modern Theologians, in which the subject of the Sacraments is treated at any length. The author has employed the scholastic method, but has avoided dryness by a number of instructive details on the Liturgy of different ancient and modern churches, on the discipline

relative to the administration of the sacraments, and the dispositions with which they ought to be given and received. 2. "Institutiones Theologicæ, ad usum seminariorum," Lyons, 1696, 4 vols. 12mo. Paris. 1700. 7 vols. in the same form. This course of theology, which was the best then extant, has been several times reprinted, in France and in other countries. It was in use in several seminaries, till some bishops, finding in it some ill-judged expressions, and also some important omissions, ordered that it should not be used in their dioceses. Juennin corrected, in his edition at Lyons, in 1705, many of the expressions which had given offence, and supplied some of the omissions which appeared suspicious. However, the Cardinal de Noailles suspended the use of it, by his edict of the 12th of June, 1706; but when the author gave his explanation, the edict was reversed, and the work continued to be used.

Juennin published for his defence, several books which are too numerous to mention. 3. "Compendium Theologiæ," Paris, 1708, 12mo. This is a good abridgement of his Theological Institutes for the use of candidates for ordination. 4. "Dissertation sur la messe de Paroisse," 12mo., Besancon; this was followed by a Reply made to a work against the Dissertation. 5. "Dissertation sur l'obligation de la Communion pascale." 6. "Denonciation des theologies de Becan d'Abely, &c., aux eveques de Chartres et de Noyon." 7. "Dissertatio quæ sit ecclesiæ Parisiensis doctrina de divinis auxiliis," 16mo. and 12mo. 8. "Theorie et pratique des Sacrements." Paris, 1713, 3 vols. 12mo: a valuable work. 9. "Theologie Moral," in questions and answers, Paris, 1741, 2 vols. 12mo. 10. "Resolutions des Cas de Conscience," Paris, 1741, 4 vols. 12mo. These three have been well received by the public.—*Tabarand.*



## JUNIUS, OR DU JON, FRANCIS.

FRANCIS JUNIUS, or DU JON, professor of divinity at Leyden, was descended of a noble family, and born at Bourges, in 1545. At the age of thirteen he began to study the law, and afterwards went to Geneva, to study the languages ; but being restrained in his pursuits for want of a proper support from his family, he resolved to get his bread by teaching school, which he pursued till 1565, when he was made minister of the Walloon Church at Antwerp. But as this was both a troublesome and dangerous post, on account of the tumultuous conflicts between the papists and protestants at that time, he was soon obliged to withdraw into Germany. He went first to Heidelberg, where the elector, Frederic III. received him very graciously. He then made a visit to his mother, who was still living at Bourges ; after which, returning to the Palatinate, he was made minister of the Church of Schoon there. This was but a small congregation ; and while he held it, he was sent by the elector to the Prince of Orange's army, during the unsuccessful expedition of 1568. He continued chaplain to that prince till the troops returned into Germany, where he resumed his church in the Palatine, and resided upon it till 1579. This year his patron, the elector, appointed him to translate the Old Testament jointly with Tremellius, which employment brought him to Heidelberg. He afterwards read public lectures at Neustadt, till Prince Casimir, administrator of the electorate, gave him the divinity-professor's chair at Heidelberg. He returned into France with the Duke de Bouillon ; and paying his respects to Henry IV., that prince sent him on some mission into Germany. Returning to give an account of his success, and passing through Holland, he was invited to be divinity-professor at Leyden ; and obtaining the permission of the French am

bassador, he accepted the offer in 1592. He had passed through many scenes of life, and he wrote an account of them himself this year: after which, he filled the chair at Leyden with great reputation for the space of ten years, when he died of the plague in 1602.

He was married no less than four times, and by his third wife had a son. The titles of his works are sixty-four in number, among which are:—Commentaries on the first three chapters of Genesis, the prophecies of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Jonah; Sacred Parallels, and Notes upon the book of Revelation; Hebrew Lexicon; Grammar of the Hebrew Tongue; Notes on Cicero's Epistles to Atticus. But what he is chiefly, and almost only known for, is his Latin version of the Hebrew text of the Bible, jointly with Tremellius. He was a man of great learning and pious zeal, and his life by Melchior Adam affords many interesting particulars of him in both characters. In the account of his life written by himself, he relates that in his youth he was seduced into atheism, from which he represents himself as almost miraculously redeemed, and this appears to have made a lasting impression on him.—*Chalmers*.

#### JURIEU, PETER.

PETER JURIEU, one of the most famous Protestant theologians of the 17th century, was born 24th of December, 1637, at Mer, in Orleannois. His father, the minister of this church, took care of his first education, and sent him to finish his studies at the academy of Saumur, where, at the early age of nineteen, he received the degree of master of arts. He then went to the universities of Holland and England, but was recalled to succeed his father in his pastoral duties. He received shortly after an offer of employment at Rotterdam, but

he refused it, because of the attachment he bore to his flock. However, the success of his first writings, caused him to be chosen, in 1674, to fill a chair in the academy of Sedan, which he accepted, although very repugnant to place himself on such a great arena. Full of ardour for study, and of zeal for the interest of his religion, Jurieu divided his time between the duties of this place, his ministerial functions, and the compilation of some writings on the theological questions, which then divided the Church. Having upheld in one of these theses, the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation, this opinion, though common among the Protestants, was attacked by some of his brethren, and condemned by the synod of Santogne. This failure did not abate his zeal, and he continued to defend the reformers on every occasion. The academy of Sedan was broken up in the month of July, 1681, and Jurieu was informed at the same time that orders had been received to arrest him as the author of a libel, named, "La Politique du clergé de France." He profited by this intelligence, and went to Rotterdam, where he received the cure of the Walloon Church, and soon after a chair of theology. When things began to be quieter, he recommenced publishing, in favour of his Church: these works succeeded each other with such rapidity, that it was said he took less time to write than his friends did to read. The revocation of the edict of Nantes, taking from him all hope of seeing his country again, put the finishing stroke to a naturally irritable temper, and from that time he attacked his adversaries with a violence that displeased the most enlightened men of his party. The charitable observations which some addressed to him on this subject, only irritated him more, and made him give way to dreadful libels against Bayle and Jaquelot, who had done no other wrong than in not partaking of his fury. All the rest of Jurieu's life was a continual battle; it might have been thought that he was con-



tinually searching for new adversaries; Romanists or Protestants, all were alike to him. At the same time that he attacked Beauval, Saurin, etc., meddling himself in the disputes of Quietism, which ought to have been strange to him, he made himself arbiter between Bossuet and Fenelon, and without regarding their high character, or their talents, he insulted these great men with inconceivable audacity. The irritation of his nerves enfeebled at length his intellect, and after having languished for many years, he died at Rotterdam, the 11th of January, 1713, aged 75 years.

Jurieu does not deserve the celebrity which he has enjoyed from the remembrance of his quarrels, and his numerous works have long since been forgotten. Antiquaries have, however, found the following:—1. *Preservatif contre le changement de religion*; Rouen, 1680, 12mo. This is a reply to the exposition of the Catholic faith by Bossuet, it was very successful among the reformers. 2. *La Politique du clergé de France pour detruire la religion Protestante*; Amsterdam, 1681, 12mo. 3. *Les derniers efforts de l'innocence affligée*; Rotterdam, 1682, 12mo. This work is a continuation of the former one. 4. *Histoire du Calvinisme et du Papisme mise en parallèle*; Rotterdam, 1682, 2 vols. 4to; *ibid.* 1683, 4 vols. 12mo. Jurieu opposed this work to the *Histoire du Calvinisme*, by Maimbourg; it contains many curious and interesting facts, but the veracity of the author is not certain. Bayle published at the same time some criticisms on the *History of Calvinism*, which was better received by the Protestants, and this was one of the causes of the hatred which Jurieu shewed towards this philosopher. 5. *L'esprit de Mons, Arnauld tiré de sa conduite et de ses ecrits etc.*; Rotterdam, 1684, 2 vols, 12mo. It is one of the most violent satires which Jurieu wrote; Arnauld left it without a reply, not thinking it right to commit himself further with such an adversary. 6. *L'accomplissement*

de prophéties; *ibid.* 1686, 2 vols, 12mo. This production is one of the most singular which has ever been produced by the union of party spirit and fanaticism. Jurieu here maintains that the papacy is the kingdom of Antichrist, mentioned in the Apocalypse; and he applies other predictions, contained in this book, to the re-establishment of Protestantism, which he fixes at the beginning of the 18th century. The Protestants were the first to deride the new prophet, who defended his opinion with all the ardour of his character. 7. *Des lettres pastorales adressées aux fidèles de France*; 1688, 12mo. He here speaks of miracles worked by a shepherdess of Crest, in Dauphiny, and does not hesitate to call all those who refused to believe them impious. 8. *Le tableau du Socinianisme*; The Hague, 1691, 12mo. Jaquelot opposed it with a work called "*Avis sur le tableau du Socinianisme*," which he disclaimed to prevent a quarrel, which is always unfortunate. 9. *La religion du latitudinaire* (against Saurin); Rotterdam, 1696; Utrecht, 1697, 12mo., rare and valuable. 10. *Histoire Critique des dogmes et des cultes bons et mauvais qui ont été dans l'Eglise, depuis Adam jusqu'à Jesus Christ*; Amsterdam, 1704; Supplement, 1705, in 4to. This is one of Jurieu's best works.—*Weiss*.

## JUSTIN MARTYR.

JUSTIN MARTYR was born at Flavia Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, the modern Naplous, in the province of Samaria. Some have placed his birth as early as the year 89, though it seems most probable that he was not born till after the beginning of the second century. Tillemont places his birth in 103. His parents were heathens, and he was himself educated in the religion of the Greeks. As he grew up, his natural love of knowledge and thirst after truth, led him to the most

noted schools of Grecian philosophy, which he looked upon as the repositories of true wisdom. At the beginning of his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, he describes the hopes with which he entered the study of philosophy, and the disappointments in which his highly raised expectations issued, till, in the Christian faith, he found that certainty and truth, which had been the constant aim of his inquiries. Justin first joined himself to a disciple of the Stoa, but after a short time left him with the bitterness of blighted hopes, since of the Deity, (in whose nature and being Justin wished, above all to be instructed,) he could say little, and, indeed, spoke of this subject as holding a very subordinate place in philosophical discussions. But still keener was the disappointment which our inquirer met with from a Peripatetic, who debased philosophy into a mere instrument of secular advantage, and concealed under his philosopher's cloak, a sordid love of gain; after giving a few lessons, he demanded of Justin the fee, the payment of which he made indispensable to a continued attendance on his philosophical lectures and exercises. Provoked by such grovelling meanness, Justin immediately quitted this pretended philosopher. But these untoward events in no degree weakened his attachment to philosophy. On the contrary, with the same confiding spirit as at first, he betook himself to the school of a Pythagorean, whose reputation for philosophical depth and refinement was not inferior to his own high self-estimation. Here again, Justin's hopes were deceived, and the truth he sought for was still involved in darkness. The philosopher launched out into the praises of music, geometry, and astronomy, and prescribed an acquaintance with these sciences as the indispensable preliminary of all philosophic inquiry, as the best means of withdrawing the soul from sensible objects, and rendering it capable of apprehending super-sensual truth; and at last he excluded Justin from the circle of his scholars, when he confessed



his ignorance on these subjects. Justin was almost in despair of ever satisfying, in the schools of the philosophers, his ardent longing after truth, when the great repute in which the Platonic philosophy was held, and the circumstance, that just at that time a very noted Platonist had opened a school in the place where he was then residing, induced him to make one more attempt. And here, indeed, his wishes were gratified even beyond his expectations. The conversations with the philosopher furnished his inquisitive mind with the richest materials; the Platonic philosophy, and especially the doctrine of ideas, powerfully impressed him; his philosophic knowledge increased daily; and he now believed himself on the verge of the consummating height of the Platonic philosophy, the intuition of the Deity; when a seeming accident gave an entirely different direction to his energies, and from a contemplative Platonist, changed him into a happy Christian believer. That he might surrender himself undisturbed to contemplation, Justin one day resorted, as was his wont, to a lonely spot on the sea-shore. But scarcely had he begun to be absorbed in the speculation to which his thoughts were turned, when happening to look back, he saw coming behind him, an aged man of gentle, venerable aspect. Surprised at this unexpected and unwished for meeting, he stopped till the stranger came up to him, and found, on inquiry, that he had come down to the beach, to wait for some absent relations, whose return he was anxiously expecting. Justin could not help giving an explanation of his own presence on that spot, and after stating that he had chosen that place for the purpose of speculation, he was not a little astonished, when the aged man said in reply: "You are then a lover of discourse, but no lover of deeds, nor of truth, nor do you attempt to be a man of action, so much as the clever disputant?"—To this unjust and unfair judgment, (as it appeared to him) passed upon his philosophical studies, Justin replied, that,

in his opinion, no employment could be more worthy and urgent, than to make it manifest, that intelligence was the presiding principle of all things, and by means of this intelligence, to discern the erroneous, and the undivine, in all other pursuits. Without philosophy there could be no clear understanding, or prudence. Philosophical knowledge ought, therefore, to be an object of universal attention; all other pursuits should retire into the background before it, or be altogether renounced, if they could not be brought into connection with philosophy.

After this enthusiastic eulogium on philosophy, the aged man inquired, whether philosophy led to happiness, and what was the proper definition of philosophy; he was told that "Philosophy was the science of being, and the knowledge of truth,—but that happiness was the reward of this knowledge and wisdom." He then endeavoured to convince this eloquent advocate, that philosophy, as long as it depended purely on its own resources, was utterly incapable of solving such a problem. For a knowledge of God, Who is the highest object of all, and especially of Platonic speculation, could not be acquired by an empirical method, or by discursive contemplation, like the knowledge of music, arithmetic, and astronomy, or an acquaintance with the healing art and military tactics. Only that knowledge of God could claim truth and certainty, which had for its origin an immediate view of the divine, or the instructions of one who enjoyed such a view. But to such an origin, philosophy in all its extent could make no pretensions. For when the Platonic philosophy asserted, that a power resided in the human reason, to rise to the vision of God, the assertion was a mere postulate without any foundation. Reason might certainly ascertain by itself, the reality of the divine existence, and moral principles,—but could not behold the essence of God. If the latter were the case, a vision of the divine essence would be possible for

the souls of beasts, since these, according to their measure, are not specifically different from human souls. Besides, this postulate of the Platonic philosophy would be overturned by another maxim of the same philosophy, that not every man, but only the righteous and the pure, can attain to the actual vision of God; for according to this, the actual attainment of this vision would depend not only on the intellectual power inherent to man by nature, but on his moral capability. But as to beasts, this subterfuge in reference to moral considerations, fails at once. For it cannot be asserted of them, that they are unrighteous. But if their corporeal organization be available as a ground of hindrance, that they cannot attain to a vision of God, it becomes a question, whether, if they had the power of speech, they might not with greater justice, depreciate human bodies, rather than men theirs.

After the aged man, by this line of argument, had endeavoured to bring the staunch advocate of Platonism to a conviction that his favourite philosophy failed exactly in the highest point of its professed aim, he adduced two articles of its psychology, in order to show Justin, in these, the unsatisfactoriness of the system; namely, the doctrines of metempsychosis, and the immortality of the soul. In reference to the former, he directed his attention to the complete uselessness of the doctrine. Since it maintained, that the souls doomed to inhabit the bodies of beasts, had neither the consciousness of their former aberrations, nor a sense of their degradation in the present state,—the doctrine was divested of the only consideration which could give it any colour of probability, that, namely, of moral retribution. But the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, so far was open to censure, that it viewed this immortality as absolute, and necessarily founded in the essential constitution of the soul. That origination in time, which the soul shared in connexion with the world, rather



involved the possibility of its destruction. Yet it could not really be affirmed, that it would ever be destroyed; on the contrary, it endures, (in order to realize the idea of retribution,) not only from its own nature, but through the will and power of Him Who gave it existence.

These statements and reasonings of the eloquent old man failed not to make a due impression on a mind so susceptible and open to conviction as Justin's. The unwavering confidence which he had hitherto placed in the correctness of the Platonic theory was shaken, and he broke out into the bitter exclamation,—“On what teacher can we rely, or to what quarter can we look for aid, if these are not the doctrines that contain the truth?”—*Dial. c. Tryph. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, c.)* The happy moment was now arrived, when he surrendered himself to Christianity. The ancient pillars of philosophical science hitherto deemed immoveable, were shattered, and the confidence they had inspired was succeeded by a yearning after some substitute; a consciousness of the insecurity and uncertainty of all merely human investigation was awakened, and gave rise to anxiety for new and satisfactory instruction. Happily, the venerable man knew how to turn to good account these feelings of the perplexed philosopher. He indicated to him by brief hints, that if he would only apply to the right source, he might easily find the truth which he had hitherto longed for so intensely, but had sought in vain among the Hellenic philosophers. He stated, that in remote ages there had appeared men, called prophets, distinguished above all the philosophers by their antiquity and sanctity, and accredited by miracles and prophecies, as organs of the divine Spirit, in whose extant writings were deposited the choicest treasures of infallible religious truth. If he turned to these records, in them he would find the amplest information respecting the first principles and design of all things,—the most satisfactory explanation on all the points which it behoved a

philosopher to know. Having thus spoken, the stranger went his way, and Justin saw him no more. But his words had kindled a flame in Justin's heart which nothing could extinguish. He attentively revolved the information he had received : he seized with eagerness the writings of the prophets : he anxiously sought the acquaintance of those persons who were known by him to be the friends of Christ : and the result of his threefold effort was his passing over to the Christian Church.

In modern times, this narrative of Justin respecting the means of his conversion to Christianity, has been regarded as a fiction, but Mr. Semisch, from whom the above outline has been taken, clearly shews that it is to be regarded as an historical statement. It is, indeed, difficult to conceive on what grounds the historical credibility of the narrative can be rejected. His conversion has been placed in the year 133 ; and if the conjecture be right, he may himself have been a sufferer in the cruelties practised on the Christians, by Bar-Kochba. It is remarkable that even after his conversion, he thought it expedient to wear the mantle or peculiar dress of the philosopher, which seems to shew that his change of religion did not cause him to give up altogether his former literary pursuits. He may also have thought it wise, by retaining the philosopher's garb to let the world, by whom Christianity was regarded as the superstition of the ignorant, perceive that a philosopher of acknowledged learning had become a Christian, and by these means to provoke the learned to inquiry. Nevertheless, the new faith, to which in so natural, and yet so wonderful a manner, the philosopher had been led, from this moment became the mainspring and centre point of all his efforts. To building up the Christian Church, both inwardly and outwardly, his life was henceforward dedicated. It was his desire, that the light which had risen on his own mind, should shine also on others ; that the repose and peace which he had

found, might also make others happy. Justin considered himself laid under a religious obligation to devote himself to the immediate, incessant propagation of the gospel. He expressly declares, that "every one who is able to speak the truth, and does not speak it, will be condemned by God." After quoting Ezek. iii. 17—19, he adds, "Therefore, being moved by fear, we apply ourselves to address [men,] according to the Scriptures, not actuated by the love of gain, or of reputation, or of pleasure; for, of these motives, no one is able to convict us."—And in another passage, he says, "I fear the judgment of God . . . . although you are unfair, I will proceed to answer all your objections and arguments; and I act in the same straight forward manner toward men of whatever nation, who are disposed to examine or question me on these things."

Justin's inclination, probably, as well as the circumstances of the times, led him to act as an itinerant evangelist. He visited Egypt, and beheld in the Isle of Pharos, near Alexandria, the remains of the cells in which the Seventy Interpreters, according to the sacred legend, separately translated into Greek, the books of the Old Testament, and yet, with a literal agreement; at Ephesus, he met with Trypho the Jew, and entered into that conversation on religion with him, the substance of which though modified here and there, is contained in the Dialogue now extant. Nor did he overlook the West. At Cumæ, in Southern Italy, he surveyed with amazement, the massive structure in which the sybil uttered her oracles: and sojourned for a long time in Rome, the metropolis of the world.

According to an ancient Matyrology, he paid two visits to Rome, and even opened a school there. However this may be, he was certainly at Rome in the reign of Antoninus Pius, to whom, in conjunction with Marcus Antoninus, Lucius Verus, the senate and the people of Rome, the first of his Apologies which stands second



in the Paris edition, was addressed. The date of this Apology, according to the Benedictine editors, is 150. "The Treatise itself," says the learned Bishop of Lincoln, "is highly deserving of our attention, as the earliest specimen which has reached our times, of the mode in which the Christians defended the cause of their religion. It is not remarkable for the lucid arrangement of the materials of which it is composed; its contents, however, may be reduced to the following heads:—I. Appeals to the justice of the ruling powers, and expostulations with them on the unfairness of the proceedings against the Christians, who were condemned without any previous investigation into their lives or opinions, merely because they were Christians; and were denied the liberty, allowed to all the other subjects of the Roman empire, of worshipping the God whom they themselves preferred. II. Refutations of the charges of Atheism, immorality, disaffection towards the emperor, which were brought against the Christians; these charges Justin refutes by appealing to the purity of the gospel-precepts, and to the amelioration produced in the conduct of those who embraced Christianity; and by stating that the kingdom, to which Christians looked forward, was not of this world, but a heavenly kingdom. III. Direct arguments in proof of the truth of Christianity drawn from miracles and prophecy. With respect to the former, Justin principally occupies himself in refuting the objection, that the miracles of Christ were performed by magical arts. With respect to the latter, he states in forcible terms the general nature of the argument from prophecy, and shews the accomplishment of many particular prophecies in the person of Jesus: inferring from their accomplishment the reasonableness of entertaining a firm persuasion that the prophecies, yet unfulfilled—that for instance, respecting Christ's second Advent—will in due time be accomplished. IV. Justin does not confine himself to defending Christianity, but occasionally becomes the

assailant, and exposes with success the absurdities of the Gentile polytheism and idolatry. In further confirmation of the innocuous, or rather beneficial character of Christianity, Justin concludes the Treatise with a description of the mode in which proselytes were admitted into the Church, of its other rites and customs, and of the habits and manner of life of the primitive Christians."

The concluding portion of this Apology, indeed, is so interesting, as conveying to us information relating to the primitive Christians, that we shall present it to the reader. After the believer is baptized, Justin says, "we take him to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled; in order that we may offer up prayers in common for ourselves and for the baptized person, and for all others in every place, that having learned the truth we may be deemed worthy to be found walking in good works, and keeping the commandments, so that we may attain to eternal salvation. Having ended our prayers, we salute each other with a kiss. Bread is then brought to that brother who presides, and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; and employs some time in offering up thanks to Him for having deemed us worthy of these gifts. The prayers and thanksgivings being ended, all the people present express their assent by saying, Amen; which in the Hebrew tongue, answers to *yévoiro* in the Greek. The president having given thanks, and the people having expressed their assent, they who are called by us *deacons* give to each of those present a portion of the bread and of the wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and carry away a portion to those who are absent. And this food is called among us *εύχαριστία*: of which no one is allowed to partake who does not believe that what we teach is true, and

has not been washed with the laver (of baptism) for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and does not live as Christ has enjoined. For we do not receive it as common bread, and common drink; but in the same manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh through the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation; so we are also taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been pronounced by the prayer of the word which came from Him, by which food, undergoing the necessary change, our flesh and blood are nourished, we are taught, I say, that this food, is the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have declared that Jesus gave them this injunction,—that having taken bread and given thanks, He said, *Do this in remembrance of me, this is my body*; and that in like manner having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, *This is my blood*; and that He distributed the bread and wine to them alone.”

He then proceeds to give an account of the meetings of the Christians on the Lord's Day. “Afterwards,” he says, “we remind each other of these things, and they who are wealthy assist those who are in need, and we are always together; and over all our offerings we bless the Creator of all things, through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. And on the day called Sunday, there is an assembling together of all who dwell in the cities and country: and the Memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read as circumstances permit. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president delivers a discourse, in which he admonishes and exhorts (all present) to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray; and as we before said, prayer being ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayers in like manner and thanksgivings, according to his ability; and the people express their assent



by saying, Amen; and the distribution of that, over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced, takes place to each, and each partakes, and a portion is sent to the absentees by the deacons. And they who are wealthy, and choose, give as much as they respectively deem fit; and whatever is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning amongst us; and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But we meet together on Sunday because it is the first day, in which God, having wrought the necessary change in darkness and matter, made the world; and because on this day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn; and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to the apostles and disciples, he taught them the things, which we now submit to your consideration."

As Bishop Kaye points out, we here find Regeneration connected with the rite of baptism, which, in the Dialogue, is called the laver of regeneration.

The second Apology is supposed to have been written not long before his martyrdom. Lardner supposes that the beginning of it is lost, and it is in other respects imperfect. It was occasioned says Bishop Kaye, by the punishment inflicted on three persons at Rome, whom Urbicus, the prefect of the city, had put to death merely because they were Christians. After exposing the gross injustice of this proceeding, Justin replies to two objections which the enemies of the Gospel were accustomed to urge. The first was, "Why, if the Christians were certain of being received into heaven, they did not destroy themselves, and save the Roman governors the trouble of putting them to death?" Justin's answer is, that if they were so to act, they would contravene the designs of God, by diminishing the number of believers;

preventing the diffusion of true religion, and, as far as depended upon them, extinguishing the human race. The second objection was, "Why, if they were regarded by God with an eye of favour, He suffered them to be exposed to injury and oppression?" Justin replies that the persecutions with which they then were, and with which many virtuous men among the heathens had before been visited, originated in the malignant artifices of demons, the offspring of the apostate angels, who were permitted to exercise their power, until the designs of the Almighty were finally accomplished. Another objection, of a different kind appears to have been urged against the Christians: that in exhorting men to live virtuously, they insisted, not upon the beauty of virtue, but upon the eternal rewards and punishments which await the virtuous and the wicked. Justin replies that these are topics on which every Christian believer in the existence of God must insist; since in that belief is involved the further belief that He will reward the good and punish the bad. With respect to direct arguments to prove the divine origin of Christianity, that which Justin principally urges is drawn from the fact, that no man ever consented to die in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenets; whereas men, even from the lowest ranks of life, braved danger and death in the cause of the Gospel. Towards the conclusion of the Tract, Justin states that he was himself induced to embrace Christianity, by observing the courage and constancy with which its professors encountered all the terrors of persecution.

The Dialogue with Trypho, to which allusion has before been made, was posterior to the first Apology, to which it contains a reference, but as to the precise date of it critics are not agreed. The Bishop of Lincoln, with his usual discrimination and judgment remarks of it:—"Although I am far from wishing to deny that there are in this Treatise many weak and inconclusive

arguments, many trifling applications and erroneous interpretations of Scripture, many attempts to extract meanings which never entered into the mind of the Sacred writer, yet I cannot think it deserving of the contempt with which some later critics have spoken of it. It proves at least that the state of the controversy was not essentially different in the days of Justin from its present state; that after the lapse of seventeen hundred years the difficulties to be encountered in disputing with the Jews, the objections to be answered, the prejudices to be overcome are nearly the same. It supplies us also incidentally with some curious facts, illustrative of the spirit by which the Jews and Christians were mutually actuated towards each other. With respect to the sentiments entertained by the Christians towards the Jews, we find Trypho, p. 263, C. inquiring whether they who lived according to the Mosaic law would be saved. Justin answers, that, as the Mosaic law comprehended the unchangeable and fundamental principles of morality, they who had lived up to it before the coming of Christ would be saved; and after His coming they also would be saved who observed the whole law, both moral and ceremonial, provided that they believed the crucified Jesus to be the Christ of God, and did not attempt to force the observance of the ritual law upon others. He admits, however, that many thought otherwise, and contended that the observance of the Mosaic rites was incompatible with the profession of Christianity. Thus the Gentile converts in Justin's age, and the Jewish in the apostolic times, appear to have been equally ready to act on the principle of exclusion. On the other hand we learn, that the Rabbis forbade their hearers to hold any intercourse with the Christians; that they pronounced curses against them in the synagogues; and that they sent persons into every part of the civilized world with directions to denounce Christianity as a pestilent heresy;



and to misrepresent the conduct and morals of its professors. Justin speaks of the proselytes as animated by a more bitter spirit of hostility than the Jews themselves. He ridicules the trivial questions on which the Jews wasted their time and labour, and censures their cavilling temper. He charges them with denying Christ through fear of persecution; with entertaining low and unworthy notions of God, and with corrupting the Septuagint Version. With respect, however, to the last charge, the Christians appear to have been more justly liable to it than the Jews. Justin further affirms that the Jews were allowed by their Rabbis to have a plurality of wives, and that the polygamy of the patriarchs was alleged in defence of the practice."

The Exhortation to the Greeks is considered spurious by Bishop Kaye, but is placed among the genuine works of Justin by Semisch. Of the other works printed in the Paris edition, it is now generally admitted that the Confutation of certain Tenets of Aristotle, the Christian Questions to the Greeks, the Greek Questions to Christians, the Answers to the Orthodox, the Exposition of the true Faith respecting the Trinity, the Epistle to Diognetus, and the Epistle to Zenas and Serenus, were not composed by Justin.

Justin, at last, verified in his own person, what had so often been the subject of his boast, both to Jews and Gentiles, respecting his fellow-Christians, namely, the steadfastness of their faith, and their cheerfulness in meeting death. He became a martyr to Christian truth. The fact is most satisfactorily attested, apart from the Martyrology, by the unanimous voice of the Christian Church. None of the ancient fathers, indeed, gives a complete account of Justin's martyrdom; but a casual intimation of Irenæus, who was a contemporary of the apologist,—the later testimonies in all the more credible ecclesiastical histories,—and, lastly, the title of "MARTYR," which Christian anti-

quity, from Tertullian's time, has constantly attached to Justin's name, furnish a warrant, that Justin really sealed his Christian profession with martyrdom. The Martyrology alone furnishes a detailed account of the close of his life. According to this account, Justin suffered death with six other Christians. Cheerful and undaunted as in life, when death was in sight, he bore his testimony for evangelical truth. The answers which he gave to the questions proposed to him by the prefect Rusticus, who tried him and his companions, breathe entirely the same spirit which emanates from his writings that still remain,—the spirit of the most unshaken love and fidelity to the Christian faith. To the questions of the prefect respecting the doctrines held by Christians, he simply and comprehensively replied: "We believe in one God, the original Creator and Framer of all things, visible and invisible, Who is not enclosed in any space, but invisible as He is, fills heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ the Son of God, Whom the prophets announced beforehand, as a teacher of truth, and herald of salvation. Of His eternal Godhead I am not able, in my weakness, to speak satisfactorily; this is the function of a prophetic power, as likewise in truth the prophets in former ages, prophesied of His becoming man." When the prefect asked the accused the question which would determine his fate, "Art thou then a Christian?" he replied with firmness, "I am a Christian." To the jeering observation of the prefect, "Thou believest then, in thy ascension to heaven, when I have caused thee to be scourged and beheaded?" Justin answered with the distinctness of a spirit full of faith, "I hope that I shall receive the gift of Christ's grace, when I have suffered that." The fresh inquiry of Rusticus, whether he really thought that he should go to heaven, and be rewarded there, was met by Justin with a still more decisive declaration,—"I not only think

so, but I know it with a certainty that does not admit of a doubt." The patience of the prefect was now exhausted. In a threatening tone, he called out to the accused, "Join together and offer a unanimous mind to the gods." On Justin's rejoining, "No reasonable man will abjure godliness and embrace impiety; the prefect said with increased warmth, "If ye will not obey, ye shall be chastised without mercy." But this threatening, so far from daunting the accused, only made his courage rise higher. "We wish nothing more," said he, "than to suffer for our Lord Jesus Christ, for this will give us salvation and joy at His dread tribunal, before which all the world must appear." With this declaration the trial closed. Forthwith the prefect passed sentence of death on the accused, and ordered him, after being scourged, to be beheaded. Thus died Justin.

What follows is extracted from Bishop Kaye, on the writings of Justin Martyr, to show how clearly Justin held the Protestant doctrine of Justification by Faith, and how those doctrines, which distinguish the Reformed Church of England from Romanism and from Calvinism, were held as we hold them now, by the primitive Christians:—"Justin uniformly assigns the merits or death of Christ as the cause, and faith as the medium by which we are justified. By Christ's stripes we are healed; by His stripes all are healed who approach the Father through Him by His blood all who believe on Him are purified; the Father willed that He should bear for the whole human race the curses due to all; He endured the servitude even of the cross in behalf of the various races of men, having purchased them by His blood and the mystery of the cross. The names of Helper and Redeemer are applied to Christ: though with an immediate reference to the power of casting out demons in His Name. With respect to the medium of justifi-



cation, it is asserted that men are purified by faith through the blood and death of Christ; and that Abraham was not justified by circumcision, but by faith. In order, however, to secure the benefits arising from Christ's death, repentance and a renunciation of our past evil habits are necessary. . . . . We may not find in Justin those nice and subtle distinctions which controversy subsequently introduced into the question of justification; but the substance of the true doctrine is there—that man is justified on account of the merits of Christ through faith, of which faith a holy life is the fruit.

“We have seen that Justin maintained such a degree of freedom in men as rendered them accountable for their actions. When, however, he is urging the argument from prophecy in the first Apology, an objection of this kind seems to have occurred to him—that events in order to be predicted must be fore-known,—that what is fore-known must be irreversibly fixed—and, consequently, that whatever happens, happens by a fatal necessity; men have nothing in their own power and are not accountable for their conduct. In reply to this objection, and in order to shew that men act well and ill by their own free choice, Justin argues thus: ‘We see that the conduct of the same man is various at different times; is sometimes good,—sometimes bad; but this could not be the case, if his character was fixed by a fatal necessity—if it was fated that he should be either good or bad. Nor would some men be good and some bad; since in that case we should represent fate as at variance with itself; or place no distinction between virtue and vice, making them dependent only on opinion. This only is irreversibly fated—that they who choose what is good shall be rewarded; they who choose what is evil, punished. For man cannot be a fit object either of reward or punishment, if he is virtuous or wicked, not by choice,

but by birth.' In another place he says, that events are foretold, not because they happen from a fatal necessity, but because God fore-knows what man will do. He brings forward a cavil of the Jews, either real or supposed, to this effect—that if it was foretold that Christ should die on the cross, and that they who caused his death should be Jews, the event could not fall out otherwise. To this he replies, that God is not the cause that men, of whom it is predicted that they shall be wicked, prove wicked; but that they are themselves the cause; and if the Scripture foretels the punishment of certain angels and men, it is because God fore-knows that they will be unchangeably wicked, not because he has made them so. He illustrates his meaning by a reference to the prediction, that the Messiah should enter Jerusalem seated on an ass. That prediction, he says, did not cause him to be the Messiah, but pointed out to mankind a mark by which they might know that he was the Messiah. In all these passages there is no mention of predestination: God fore-knows events, but does not pre-ordain them. He acts, however, or rather forbears to act, in consequence of this fore-knowledge; for instance, He defers the punishment of the devil and his angels, out of consideration to the human race; because He fore-knows that many, now living or yet unborn, will repent and be saved; and He will not, therefore, bring on the consummation of all things until the number of those fore-known to be good and virtuous, shall be accomplished. It should be observed that these remarks are for the most part, introduced incidentally, and ought not, therefore, to be construed too strictly. If Justin held the doctrine of predestination at all, it must have been in the Arminian sense—*ex prævisis meritis.*”

The best known and most useful editions of Justin

Martyr are those of Sylbergius and Prudentius Marianus.—*Bishop Kaye. Semisch. Acts of Martyrdom, in Ruinart. Cave. Life prefixed to the Paris edition.*

JUXON, WILLIAM.

WILLIAM JUXON was born at Chichester, in 1582, and educated at Merchant-Taylors' School; from whence he was elected to St. John's College, Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship. He studied the law, and entered at Gray's Inn; but altered his mind, took orders, and was presented to the vicarage of St. Giles, Oxford, with which he held the rectory of Somerton. In 1621, he was chosen president of his college, after which he rose rapidly through the interest of Archbishop Laud, being successively made dean of Worcester, clerk of the closet, Bishop of Hereford, dean of the Chapel Royal, and in 1633, Bishop of London.

The sweetness of his temper, the kindness and courtesy of his manners, and his uniform benevolence made Bishop Juxon a general favourite; and Archbishop Laud fixed upon him, as a fit person to hold a secular office under government. This was one of Laud's fatal errors. He did not perceive and make allowance for the change of public opinion. Bishops had, before the Reformation, become great men by holding secular appointments, and the archbishop thought to restore the order to its ancient importance in men's eyes, by reverting to the exploded system. He forgot that bishops held secular offices formerly from the necessity of the case, and because there were not a sufficient number of the laity qualified, and that the fact itself, though necessary, was still an evil, since it interfered with their higher and spiritual duties. In Laud's own time the laity were better qualified than the clergy for office, and the appoint-



ment of the clergy was justly offensive, both as an insult to the laity, and as leading the people to suppose that the bishops had nothing to do in their dioceses. Under this false policy, in 1625, Juxon was appointed to the post of lord-high-treasurer, the highest office at that time in the kingdom, and next in precedence to that of the archbishop and to the great seal, which had not been held by a clergyman since the reign of Henry VII. This office he resigned in 1641, when it was admitted by all parties that he had held it without reproach. Lord Falkland, indeed, when attacking him in the long parliament, bore testimony to him, that "in an unexpected place and power, he expressed an equal moderation and humility, being neither ambitious before, nor proud after, either of the crosier or the white staff." The general harmlessness of his character enabled him to remain for the most part undisturbed at Fulham, during the civil war. Nevertheless, he remained firm to his principles, and steady in his loyalty to the king, by whom he was frequently consulted. He was in attendance upon the king at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, in 1648, and at his majesty's particular desire, he waited upon him at Cotton House, in Westminster, on the 21st of January following, the day after the commencement of the king's trial. During that time of sorrow he acted as the king's spiritual adviser, and his majesty declared that he was at that period his greatest comfort and support, or, as the king expressed himself, Bishop Juxon's company was "no small refreshing to his spirit in that his uncomfortable condition."

The king knew Juxon's faithfulness, that with all his gentleness of manner he was firm and uncompromising in principle, and thoroughly truthful. The king had proof of this on an important occasion, for when the bills for the continuance of parliament, and the attainder of the Earl of Stafford, had passed the two houses, and Charles was in doubt and perplexity about giving his

assent thereto, while other divines were resorting to various kinds of casuistry, Bishop Juxon bluntly told the king not to do anything against his conscience for all the world.

Bishop Juxon was in attendance upon the king upon the scaffold. On the 27th of January, the last day of the king's trial, and before he was carried into Westminster Hall, he and the bishop were private near an hour, at Cotton House. The same night, after sentence, Colonel Hacker, who commanded the guards at St. James' about the king, would have placed two musqueteers in the king's bed-chamber; but Bishop Juxon and Mr. Herbert apprehending the disturbance it would give the king in his meditations, never left the colonel until he had reversed his order by withdrawing those men. The king now bidding farewell to the world, spent the remainder of his time in prayer and other exercises of devotion, and in conference with that meek and learned bishop, who, under God, was a great support and comfort to him in his afflicted condition. That evening the bishop prayed with him, and read some select chapters out of the holy Scripture. The next morning, being Sunday, January 28, Bishop Juxon was early with the king, prayed with him, and preached on Rom. ii. 16. Monday, January 29, his lordship spent almost most part of the day with his majesty, and prayed with him, not taking leave of him until some hours after night; and, at parting, the king desired him to come early the next morning. He came accordingly at the appointed hour, and after having continued a considerable time in prayer and meditation, attended his majesty from St. James' to Whitehall, walking through the park on the king's right hand. When they came to Whitehall, he prayed there again with his majesty in his cabinet-chamber, and administered the sacrament to him. To conclude this melancholy scene, he attended the king upon the scaffold, where these words passed between them:—

*Dr. Juxon.*—"Will your majesty (though it may be very well known your majesty's affections to religion, yet it may be expected that you should) say somewhat for the world's satisfaction?"

*King.*—"I thank you very heartily, my lord, for that, I had almost forgotten it. In truth, sirs, my conscience in religion, I think, is very well known to all the world; and, therefore, I declare before you all, that I die a Christian, according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left me by my father; and this honest man, I think, will witness it."

His majesty then called to Dr. Juxon for his night-cap, and having put it on, he said to the executioner, Does my hair trouble you?—And then turning to Dr. Juxon, the king said, "I have a good cause, and a gracious God on my side."

*Dr. Juxon.*—"There is but one stage more. This stage is turbulent and troublesome; it is a short one: but you may consider it will soon carry you a very great way: it will carry you from earth to heaven; and there you shall find a great deal of cordial joy and comfort."

*King.*—"I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown; where no disturbance can be, no disturbance in the world."

*Dr. Juxon.*—"You are exchanged from a temporal to an eternal crown, a good exchange."

Then the king took off his cloak and his George; giving his George to Dr. Juxon, saying, Remember! After the execution, the pious bishop took care of the king's body, and accompanied it to the Royal Chapel at Windsor, standing ready, with the common prayer-book in his hand, to have performed his last duty to his kind master; but he was not permitted by Colonel Whitchcott, governor of the castle.

Juxon continued in the quiet possession of Fulham till this time, and some months after; but, upon the abolition of kingly government, with the house of lords, and



the establishing of a common-wealth, the ensuing year, 1649, he was deprived, having been spared longer than any of his brethren. After this he retired to his own estate, the manor of Little Compton, in Gloucestershire, where he passed his days in a private and devout condition.

At the Restoration, aged as he was, he was appointed, we might almost say by acclamation, Archbishop of Canterbury. He was not able to exert himself much in his spiritual office, but he was a benefactor to the see, for during the short time he held the archbishopric, he expended on the property fifteen thousand pounds; he moreover augmented the vicarages, the great tithes of which were appropriated to the see. He died June 4, 1663.

His corpse was carried to Oxford, and interred there with great solemnity, on the ninth of that month, in St. John's College chapel, in a vault adjoining to another, then made to receive that of Archbishop Laud, which was laid therein a few days after. Archbishop Juxon, by his last will, bequeathed £7000 to the college, which was afterwards laid out in the purchase of an estate of £350 per annum. He left also £100 to the parish of St. Giles, of which he had been vicar; the same sum to four other parishes in Oxford, and sums for the repair of St. Paul's and Canterbury Cathedrals, and other charitable uses, in all to the amount of £5000. Wood tells us, that he was a man of primitive sanctity, wisdom, piety, learning, patience, charity, and all apostolical virtues. This may perhaps be thought to savour too much of a panegyric; though it is confirmed by the public intelligence of that time. To which may be added the character of him given by Whitelock, and other of his contemporaries; that he was a comely person, of an active and lively disposition, of great parts and temper, full of ingenuity and meekness, not apt to give offence to any, and willing to do good to all; of great

moderation, sincerity, and integrity, insomuch that he was the delight of his time, and extorted a reverence and respect from those very persons who had ruined his order. There is extant of his:—A Sermon on Luke xviii. 31; a Treatise, entitled *Χαρις και Ειρήνη*: or, Some Considerations upon the act of Uniformity; with an expedient for the satisfaction of the clergy within the province of Canterbury. By a servant of the God of peace. London, 1662, 4to. In this work he shews himself to be no friend to the scheme of a comprehension. A Catalogue of Books in England, alphabetically digested, Lond. 1658, bears his name.—*Le Neve. Wood. Whitelock. Clarendon.*

## KEITH, ROBERT.

ROBERT KEITH was born on the 7th of February, 1681, at Uras, in Scotland. He was educated at Aberdeen, and in 1703 became tutor to his kinsman, Lord Keith, with whom, and his brother, he continued seven years. He was admitted to the order of deacons, by the Right Rev. George Haliburton, Bishop of Aberdeen, in 1710, and became chaplain to the Earl of Errol, whom he accompanied, in 1712, to the baths of Aix-la-Chapelle.

On his return from the continent, in 1713, he was ordained priest, and appointed to officiate in a chapel, at Edinburgh. He was consecrated bishop on the 18th of June, 1727, and was distinguished by the moderate and judicious course he took in the controversies which existed among the Non-jurors of Scotland and England. (*See Lives of Brett and Hickes.*) As soon as Bishop Keith was invested with the episcopal office in 1727, he was intrusted with the superintendence of the extensive district of Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles. As he continued to reside in Edinburgh, we are not informed in what way he discharged the duties incident to that

laborious appointment. There are extant, no doubt, several records, which shew that he was from time to time employed in providing his remote diocese with competent clergymen, as well as with other means of Christian knowledge and divine grace; but there remains, notwithstanding, no small degree of obscurity, both in regard to the precise manner in which he exercised his episcopal functions, and also as to the extent of the period during which he continued Bishop of Caithness, and of the Isles.

The general constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Scotland was formed at the consecration of a successor to Bishop Rattray, in the diocese of Dunkeld, which was performed at Edinburgh, by Bishops Keith, Falconar, White, and Rait, when it was resolved by these fathers, that they should constitute themselves into a regular synod for transacting the public business of the Church; on which occasion, Mr. Keith was unanimously chosen Primus, and Mr. Alexander, the new bishop, was appointed clerk. Availing themselves of the ecclesiastical knowledge and matured experience of the late Primus, Rattray, the bishops, being thus met together, proceeded to take into consideration the draughts of certain canons which he had bequeathed to them, for the more formal exercise of their authority in the government of their districts; and, after a deliberate conference, they succeeded,—as well by making suitable alterations on those with which they were thus furnished, as by drawing up several new ones,—in producing a set of rules which gained at once the universal acceptance of the clergy, and also proved of considerable use in promoting uniformity of sentiment as well as of practice in almost all the professional matters concerning which they had been formerly divided.

It is a trite observation, that the man who most conscientiously does his duty is not always rewarded with the first burst of popular praise; and we find, accord-



ingly, that Bishop Keith was by no means beloved by the presbytery of Edinburgh, among whom he had been so many years resident. He was seldom asked by any of them to perform in their congregations the offices peculiar to his Order; and if we were to judge from a variety of addresses, remonstrances, and replies, which are still on record, we should say that his intercourse with the inferior clergy was almost entirely confined to disputes about the limits of Episcopal jurisdiction, and the privileges of the priesthood. The presbyters of Edinburgh, who, at the period in question, used to elect a moderator, and assume considerable powers as a regular and standing *presbytery*, were extremely jealous of any higher authority in the Church; whilst the bishops, on the other hand, regulating their proceedings by a regard to abstract principle and ancient usage, rather than by a due consideration of the circumstances in which late events had placed their Communion, and still less by views of mere expediency, appear, on several occasions, to have aimed at the possession of a degree of power, the exercise of which would inevitably have sunk the second order of ministers into absolute insignificance. The enactment of canons, in 1743, as laws regulating the practice and defining the obedience of the whole Church, without desiring the advice or concurrence of any of the presbyters, was a stretch of prerogative which could not prove agreeable to the latter description of clergy; and although the bishops might have no difficulty in proving that they had not, on this occasion, exceeded the limits of the authority inherent in their Order, and which had been frequently exercised by the rulers of the Church in the purest times of Christianity, they would yet have attained their object more effectually by conceding a little to the spirit of the age and the wishes of their brethren.

The literary labours of Bishop Keith are well known to every scholar and antiquary. His greatest work, The

History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland, from the beginning of the Reformation in the reign of King James V. to the retreat of Queen Mary into England, is chiefly esteemed for the immense collection of authentic documents with which he contrived to enrich it. "Such a book," said Bishop Smith, his correspondent and antagonist, "will stand the test of ages, and will always be valued, because no fact is related but upon the best authority." The author, it is true, has not escaped the charge of partiality in his views, and of a certain bias in his reasoning: but he has always been allowed the merit of a full and candid statement of events, whatever might be their effect upon his own conclusions; and has never been taxed, even by the most uncharitable adversaries, with mutilating records, either to screen the reputation of a friend, or to impeach the motives of an enemy. His stately volume, therefore, will never cease to occupy a respectable place in the library of the historian; and every reader who is desirous to have an intimate acquaintance with the annals of Scotland, during the troubled and afflicted times which followed upon the death of James V., will regret that Bishop Keith did not live to complete his arduous undertaking. It appears that he left, at his death, a few sheets of the second volume. These, with certain other manuscripts, must have passed into the hands of his daughter's family; but all the inquiry that I have made respecting them, observes the late Bishop Russell, has only satisfied me that they are no longer in existence.

From a casual notice, contained in a letter addressed to Bishop Rait, there is reason to believe that Bishop Keith published, about the year 1743, some *Select Pieces* of Thomas à Kempis, translated into English. In his preface to the second volume of these *Pieces*, he has introduced some very objectionable addresses to the Virgin Mary; for which imprudence, he thought it

necessary to enter into some explanation with his more scrupulous brethren.

The Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops, which has proved the most popular of all his works, was given to the world in the year 1755. He died at Bonnyhaugh, January 20, 1757.—*Russell's Life prefixed to Catalogue of Scottish Bishops.*

## KELLISON, MATTHEW.

MATTHEW KELLISON, a Roman Catholic divine, was born in Northamptonshire, in 1560. He took his doctor's degree in Rheims, where he was rector of the university; from whence he removed to Douay, and became president of the English College. He died in 1641. His works are:—1. Survey of the New Religion. 2. Reply to Sutcliffe. 3. Oratio coram Henrico IV. rege Christianissimo. 4. The Gagg of the Reformed Gospel. 5. Examen Reformationis. 6. The Right and Jurisdiction of the Prince and Prelate. This he is said to have written in his own defence, having been represented at Rome as a favourer of the oath of allegiance. In the meantime, the work was represented to King James I. as allowing of the deposing power, and of murdering excommunicated princes, and his majesty thought proper to inquire more narrowly into the matter; the result of which was, that Dr. Kellison held no such opinions, and had explained his ideas of the oath of allegiance with as much caution as could have been expected. 7. A Treatise of the Hierarchy of the Church; against the Anarchy of Calvin; 1629, 8vo. In this Treatise, he had the misfortune to differ from the opinion of his own Church in some respect. His object was, to prove the necessity of Episcopal government in national Churches; and he particularly pointed at the state of the Catholics in England, who were without such a government.



Some imagined that the book would be censured at Rome, because it seemed indirectly to reflect upon the pope, who had not provided England with bishops to govern the Papists there, although frequently applied to for that purpose; and because it seemed to represent the regulars as no part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and consequently not over zealous in supporting the dignity of the Episcopal order. The court of Rome, however, took no cognizance of the matter; but others attacked Dr. Kellison's work with great fury. The controversy increasing, the bishops and clergy of France espoused his cause, and condemned several of the productions of his antagonists, in which they had attacked the hierarchy of the Church. Dr. Kellison's other works were:—8. A brief and necessary Instruction for the Catholics of England, touching their Pastor; 1631. 9. Comment. in tertiam partem Summæ Sancti Thomæ; 1632, fol. 10. A Letter to King James I., in MS. Sutcliffe and Montague were his principal antagonists among the Protestants.—*Dod. Pits. Fuller.*

#### KEMPIS, THOMAS A.

THOMAS A KEMPIS, surnamed Haemmerchen, or Haemerlein, in Latin, Malleolus, was a pious monk of Mount St. Agnes. He was born about the year 1380, at Kempen, in the diocese of Cologne, (not Campau, in the diocese of Utrecht, as the Dutch biographer, Badius, relates,) and is much less famed for the smaller works which he has composed, than for the celebrated "Imitation of Christ," which has been attributed to him. Francis de Tob, another biographer, who was a regular monk of the same house, has supposed him to be a disciple of Gerard le Grand; following the opinion of the Abbé Trithemes, who makes Thomas to have flourished in 1410.

Some say that he was a prior, and one of the first fathers of the order of Windesheim, but he is here confounded with John de Kempis, his eldest brother. Thomas à Kempis was only a disciple of the master, Florent Radewin, rector of the congregation, and vicar of the Church of Deventer. John de Kempis having given him a recommendation, Thomas was received, at the age of twelve years, into the house of a pious lady; he was well supplied with books, and attended the school of Jean de Bœme, the brother of the good vicar. He studied grammar, Latin, and music. He assisted his master in the service of the church, and sang in the choir. He was admitted after six years, not into the house of Florentius, and his fellow clergy, as Rosweyde asserts, but to the rank of student. As Kempis himself says, in the *Life of Arnold*, his fellow student, he remained there only one year. There he learnt to transcribe and read the manuscript of the Bible, and he also gained a knowledge of sacred and moral literature. In 1399, the humble scholar of Deventer, having come to Juxoll to obtain the indulgences, (these are the terms of his *Chronicle*,) went to the monastery of Mount St. Agnes, of which his brother was prior, and was received there. This house was newly founded, and very poor. The two brothers gave the produce of the sale of their patrimony to enrich it. It was no less necessary to work; the prior set an example to his brother, in presiding over the building of the monastery, and the culture of the surrounding lands.

In the intervals of work, he caused books to be transcribed for the use of the house, and also to obtain money, which was much wanted. Thomas thus copied many books of chants, which are called *Canticles*, in the list of his works given by the regular monks of Rebdorf. He gave himself up to his work, and only took the monastic habit in 1406; he did not, however, declare himself till a year later. Six years passed in work

mixed with religious exercises, until the buildings were completed, and the church consecrated; when Thomas was promoted to the priesthood, in 1413. A physical organization, joined to a gentle and patient character, and his taste for transcribing, made him an excellent caligrapher. He finished his first Missal, in folio, in 1414, and a second, in 1417, a specimen of which may be seen in a book called "*Certitudo moralis d' Amort.*" A voluminous extract from the small works of St. Bernard was transcribed by Thomas with the greatest care, and is most likely the same as that possessed by the monastery of Val-rouge, near Brussels. This work brought out in him the religious instruction, which from the nature of his occupation might not have been developed till a later period. Led by his pious zeal to treasure up in his mind the maxims which he copied, and the examples of the earlier disciples of Florent and Gerard, he was prepared to be useful in training students for the newly founded monastery. It was a typographical error in the *Chronicles of Kempis*, that Amort, in his *Dissertation*, entitled, "*Deductio Critica*," makes him sub-prior in 1420. The "*Hortulus Rosarum*," the "*Vallis Liliorum*," and other similar compositions, bring to mind the imaginative style of the author of the extracts from St. Bernard's smaller works, and furnish some maxims which appear analogous to those in the "*Imitation*," but which appear also in the spiritual letters of Gerson about the same period. Kempis, however, continued to follow his favourite occupation, in transcribing an entire Bible, in four vols., folio. This enormous work occupied him for fifteen years, the first volume being finished in 1427, the second in 1432, the third in 1436, and the last in 1439. This wonderful and valuable work was preserved in the monastery of Corpus Christi at Milan. Rosweyde is mistaken in saying that the whole work was finished in 1427. It was in the course of copying the second volume that the



patience of Kempis was put to the test, by an event which interrupted the work for some time. The whole diocese of Utrecht had been excommunicated on account of a difference between the clergy and the pope, about the election of a bishop; the monks of Mount St. Agnes were forced to choose between adhering to the choice of the clergy, and leaving the diocese: they preferred retiring to Lunekirk, in Holland. Kempis accompanied them to this retreat, but soon after was sent to a monastery, near Arnheim, with his brother, then seventy years old, who died in 1432. At this time, the interdict was removed, and Thomas returned to Mount St. Agnes. This was the only journey which he ever took, for he had neither time nor opportunity to learn another language than his own, and his writings offer but a circumscribed number of words used in his own country. When he had finished copying the Bible, he commenced the compilation known by the name of the *Imitation of Christ*; he has subscribed it with the same form of writing as the Bible: "*Finctus et completus per manus fratris Thomas à Kempis, anno 1441.*" These books are extracts from a Collection called, "*Consolationes Internæ,*" but in this book they are written as separate treatises, with particular titles, but without any regular order; they were copied under the same titles, and sent pro pretio to different houses of Flanders and Germany. It was in this way that the "*Soliloquium Animæ*" was transcribed for the regular monks of Rebdorf, and is attributed by these monks to their pious brother. Hence, the four books of the *Imitation*, and the other small works of the Collection, are named in the list which has been published by Heser, from the manuscripts of Rebdorf.

Thomas was made steward of the monastery, but being less able to rule the affairs of a house, than to transcribe books, or train novices, he composed the treatises, "*De fidei Dispensatore,*" and the "*Dialogus Novitiorum de*

Contemptu mundi," divided originally into four books, of which the Lives of Gerard, Florent, and their disciples, formed the greatest part, and which have since been separated, as if to remove one cause of the mistake which has made people attribute to him the four books of the Imitation, under the name of "De contemptu mundi." Thomas was again elected sub-prior in 1448. Being then, as he himself says, sixty-seven years old, he finished several Sermons written in a grave and sententious style, and abounding in common-place expressions, and intended for novices. The most ancient manuscripts of the Imitation were revised and corrected by himself, as is proved by the numerous erasures made in his own hand-writing; he has substituted old lessons for new, while he has left many faults, which have either escaped his notice, or of which he was ignorant. The manuscript of 1441, is the most ancient that has Kempis' name attached to it. That of Augsburg, of 1440, which is mentioned with his name in the "Artissima Testimonia," of Bollandus, is really anonymous. It had not been produced before under this name since the famous contest which has decided against Gerson and in favour of Kempis; and the manuscript which the Abbé Ghesquiére has made known, and which is now in the hands of M. Van Hulteen, has neither date nor name, save in a small note on the margin. The manuscript of Louvain, mentioned by Desbillons, from the "Vindiciæ Kempenses," of Rosweydyus, is anonymous and without any date.

Thomas à Kempis having become very infirm, quietly and peaceably terminated his long career, in 1471, at the age of ninety years. He had carried on the Chronicle of Mount St. Agnes, until the year of his death. The eldest of the brethren, who had been his companion for fifty years, continued it, and the praise of Kempis is the subject which occupied his attention.—*Gence.*

## KEN, THOMAS.

OF this eminent saint, venerated by his contemporaries, and of whom, although a prelate of the Church of England, even Mr. Macaulay speaks with admiration and respect, very few memorials have been preserved. He was descended from an ancient family, seated at Ken Place, in Somersetshire, and born at Berkhamstead, in Hertfordshire, in July, 1637. At thirteen years of age he was sent to Winchester School, and from thence removed to New College, in Oxford, of which he became a probationer-fellow, in 1677, George Marshall being then warden. This Marshall was not a *Wykehamist*, or elected, according to the statutes, by the fellows, but *obtruded* on the college by the parliamentary visitors, and appointed, *reclamante collegio*, in 1649.

The intrepid stand which the true sons of Wykeham make on this occasion has been little noticed, though their conduct was as noble as that of the president and fellows of Magdalen, in the face of arbitrary power; but the parliamentary visitors knew better how to do their work, and they did it more effectually than James the Second.

Dr. Pink, the warden, died soon after this "direful visitation," as Ayliffe calls it, began. An injunction was issued to the fellows of New College, that they should *not* proceed to elect a warden, but wait the recommendation of the visitors. The fellows took no notice, but proceeded, according to the statutes, to elect one of their own body, and elected Dr. Henry Stringer, almost unanimously, in defiance of the imperative Puritans, and in disdain of the strongest solicitations of Lord Say, who had been educated himself a *Wykehamist*.

Walker says, a *Major Jordan* was *thrust in*! Wood says nothing of this Jordan; but the "saints," in the



plentitude of their dispensing and dictatorial power,—far greater than that of *James the Second*,—nominated as warden, White—distinguished by the title of the “patriarch of Dorchester,” in Dorsetshire, and rector of Trinity Church there. The obstinate sons of Wykeham, however, rejected the “patriarch of Dorchester,” though educated at Winchester, and formerly fellow of New College, and elected one whose character, learning, and piety, was of a different complexion.

The visitors, however, knew their strength,—they ejected, by virtue of the parliamentary *lex fortioris*, Dr. Stringer, the legitimate warden, *vi et armis*! He retired to London; and, like many other estimable characters, died obscurely there, probably in poverty, a few years afterwards.

It is said, the “patriarch of Dorchester,” having been a fellow, from high principles, refused the honour, and the visitors nominated, as in insult, a *novum monstrum* of a warden, George Marshall, who was neither Wykehamist nor fellow, but who had been chaplain to the *godly* garrison of the parliament. Under this *alien* wardenship, Ken became probationer-fellow, not long before this *anomalous* warden's death. Harris, the presbyterian warden of Winchester, and this obtruded warden of New College, died the same year, 1658. The fellows afterwards proceeded in their regular mode of election, which every true Wykehamist will pray may have no other interruption as long as these ancient and hallowed seats of learning shall flourish, to produce future Lowths and future Kens.

It appears that Ken was unwilling to proceed to his degree while the university was under the guidance of these dissenters, for he did not become B.A. till after the Restoration, in 1661. To the degree of M.A. he proceeded in 1664, to that of B.D., in 1678, and to that of D.D., in 1679.

In 1666, Ken renewed his acquaintance with Win-

chester College, being elected a fellow upon that foundation. There he found Izaak Walton, his friend and brother-in-law, an inmate in the episcopal palace; for Bishop Morley, who was lately translated to Winchester from Worcester, had found a refuge in the troubles of the rebellion under Walton's roof, and now repaid his hospitality with a munificent care both of him and of his relations. To these circumstances Ken owed the patronage of Bishop Morley, who made him his domestic chaplain, presented to him the rectory of Brixton, or Brighstone, in the Isle of Wight, (which he held from 1666 to 1670); and besides this, preferred him in 1669 to a prebendal stall in Winchester Cathedral. He was also presented by the same indulgent patron to the rectory of Woodhay, which *his conscience* soon urged him to resign, though it was tenable *in law* with Brighstone. Amid the studies and duties of his station at Winchester, he voluntarily undertook a pastoral charge, and "kept a constant course of preaching at St. John's Church in the Soak, near Winchester (where there was no preaching minister, and which he therefore called his cure,) and brought many anabaptists to the Church of England, and baptized them himself."

In the year 1675, Ken, with his nephew Izaak Walton, travelled through Italy and to Rome. It was the year of jubilee; and every interest therefore of such a tour was redoubled to Ken, the divine and the poet. To some persons this journey seemed hazardous to the principles of both tourists; but Izaak Walton returned to fill a canons stall at Salisbury; and Ken was afterwards heard to say, that he had great reason to give God thanks for his travels, since (if it were possible) he returned more confirmed in the purity of the Protestant religion than he was before."

Twice afterwards Ken was a traveller. Having been already appointed chaplain to the king, he was sent, in

1679, to the court of the Hague, as chaplain to Mary, Princess of Orange. Here his honourable interposition in an affair of much delicacy brought upon him the anger of the prince. Count Zulenstein, uncle of the Prince of Orange, accompanied his nephew into England, when he came to solicit the hand of the Princess Mary, and won and abused the affections of Jane, daughter of Sir Henry Wroth, one of the companions of Mary. The count was persuaded, by the remonstrances of Ken, to make the injured lady his wife; which was so deeply resented by his royal kinsman, that Ken judged it better to leave the court; to which, however, he was afterwards recalled. He left the Hague the following year, bearing with him the personal malice of the prince, and the entire confidence and esteem of the princess. These consequences of his residence in Holland cast more than once a varied colour on his future career.

Afterwards, in 1683, Ken accompanied Lord Dartmouth, as his chaplain, to the demolishing of Tangier.

On his return, Ken resumed his station at Winchester, occupying his prebendal residence. Charles the Second was laying the foundation of a royal residence in Winchester. On one occasion, the licentious monarch demanded of Ken the use of his house for his favourite, "Nell Gwynn." The prebendary's answer was worthy of the future bishop: "Not for his kingdom."

There were some few redeeming traits in the licentious tyrant, Charles the Second, which are not to be found in the character of his equally licentious and more tyrannical brother, James. Charles respected the independent virtue of Ken. A vacancy soon occurring in the see of Bath and Wells, Charles, as his own especial act, named Ken to fill it, who accordingly was consecrated bishop of that diocese on Saint Paul's day, 1684.



His feelings, in this elevated state, are described by him in some lines addressed to his friend Dr. Hooper, in the dedication to his "Hymnarium:"—

"Among the herdsmen, I a common swain  
Liv'd pleas'd with my low cottage on the plain ;  
Till up, like Amos, on a sudden caught,  
I to the past'ral chair was trembling brought ;  
Heaven deemed that step for me, I fear, too bold,  
And let a stranger climb into my fold ;  
I, who the stranger saw my fold invade,  
Was forced to fly to unfrequented shade ;  
Like captive Judah by the stream to dwell,  
And with my drooping eyes the waters swell."

Few as were the years during which Ken filled this see, and important as were the political events in which he was personally engaged, yet how actively and earnestly did the bishop devote himself to the duties of his sacred office! The instruction of the young, then a most neglected duty, was one of his first objects. Many schools were established, and for them his "Exposition of the Church Catechism" was written. We may also mention the publication of certain Prayers, a pastoral Letter to his clergy, "concerning their behaviour in Lent," the "Articles of Visitation and Inquiry on Matters Ecclesiastical," at his visitation, and his valuable "Directions for Prayer," which he addressed to the poor inhabitants of his diocese, with this paternal greeting: "Thomas, their unworthy bishop, wisheth the knowledge of the love of God." Of the importance of prayer he observes, "It is as easy and as possible to preserve a natural life without daily bread, as a Christian life without daily prayer." He then adds, "Sure am I, the zeal I ought to have for your salvation can suggest to me nothing more conducing to the good of your souls than to exhort and beseech you all, of either sex,

to learn how to pray. *This is the first general request I shall make to you*; and I am the more earnest in it because my own sad experience has taught me how strangely ignorant common people are of this duty; some never pray at all, pretending they were never taught, or that their memories are bad, or that they are not book-learned, or that they want money to buy a book, and by this means they live and die rather like beasts than men." The "sad experience" of many living clergymen will, it is to be feared, confirm this statement, even after the lapse of more than a century and a half, and though so much has been done to promote the religious education of the people.

These circumstances, in their several ways, evince Ken's love for his flock, and fervent zeal in his high calling.

His Letter, exhorting his clergy to collect in behalf of the French Protestants, was published in 1686, and so worthy did he deem them of Christian sympathy, that, having once received a fine of £4,000, he gave great part of it to this fund.

Soon after Ken's nomination to the see of Bath and Wells, Charles II. was on his death-bed, and he who had nobly denied to his king an accommodation for his harlot, now applied himself to the awakening of the king's conscience: he spoke with a great elevation both of thought and expression, like a man inspired. He resumed the matter often, and pronounced many ejaculations and prayers, which affected all who were present, except him that was most concerned, who seemed to take no notice of him, and made no answers to him. He pressed the king six or seven times to take the sacrament, but the king always declined it, saying he was very weak. A table with the elements upon it, ready to be consecrated, was brought into the room; which occasioned a report to be then spread.

about that he had received it. Ken pressed him to declare that he desired it, and that he died in the communion of the Church of England. To that he answered nothing.

The following is the account of Hawkins, as related to him by Ken himself. "And now at this juncture it was, when the king's period of life drew near, his distemper seizes his head, and our bishop well knowing how much had been put off to that point, and fearing the strength of his distemper would give him but little time, (as indeed it proved,) his duty urging him, he gave a close attention by the *royal bed, without intermission for at least three whole days and nights!* watching, at proper intervals, to suggest pious and proper thoughts and ejaculations, on so serious an occasion; in which time the Duchess of Portsmouth coming into the room, the bishop prevailed with his majesty *to have her removed!* and took the occasion of representing the injury done to the queen so effectually, that his majesty was induced to send for the queen, and *asking pardon*, had the satisfaction of her forgiveness before he died. The bishop having *homely* urged the necessity of a full, and prevailed, as is hoped, for a *sincere* repentance, several times proposed the administration of the holy sacrament, but, although it was not *absolutely* rejected, it was yet delayed from time to time, till (I know not by *what* authority) the bishop, and all others present, were put out from the presence for about the space of an hour, during which time, it has been suggested, father Huddleston was admitted to give extreme unction."

In the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion, the prisoners shared both the alms and the prayers of Bishop Ken. He daily visited them in the gaol, and while labouring for the preservation of their bodies, he did not neglect their spiritual welfare. Very many years afterwards, when summoned before the privy council for an alleged offence, he thus alludes to this occurrence: "A



thousand or more engaged in the rebellion of the Duke of Monmouth; and many of them were such which I had reason to believe to be ill men, and void of all religion: and yet for all that, I thought it my duty to relieve them. It is well known to the diocese that I visited them night and day, and I thank God I supplied them with necessaries myself, as far as I could, and encouraged others to do the same; and yet King James never found the least fault with me."

We ought, when mentioning the Duke of Monmouth, to notice another fearless proceeding on the part of Ken. After the victory of Sedgmoor, it is well known that the conduct of the victors was stained by the most disgraceful cruelty. Lord Feversham, the general, was thus acting towards some disarmed enemies, to whom he had granted quarter, when Ken rushed into the midst of a military execution, or rather massacre, calling out, "My lord, this is murder in law. These poor wretches, now the battle is over, must be tried before they can be put to death." His interposition only suspended the barbarity of the conquerors. Bishop Ken, it appears, corresponded with the king himself on their sufferings in his diocese, and did not fail to remonstrate against those excesses which he had so nobly interposed to prevent.

He was an industrious preacher in his diocese, often visiting in the summer the larger parishes, where he would preach twice a day, confirm, and catechise. He was distinguished as a preacher in the metropolis also. Indeed, James II. is reported to have said, that while father Hall was the best preacher amongst the Roman Catholics, Bishop Ken occupied that place amongst the Protestants.

It has been supposed (and the conjecture seems to be well founded) that Ken was the original from which Dryden drew his character of "The Good Parson."

The poet thus beautifully describes his good Parson in the pulpit :—

“Mild was his accent, and his action free.  
With eloquence innate his tongue was armed,  
Though harsh the precept, yet the preacher charmed.  
For, letting down the golden chain from high,  
He drew his audience upward to the sky :  
And oft, with holy hymns, he charmed their ears,  
(A music more melodious than the spheres,)  
For David left him, when he went to rest,  
His lyre ; and after him he sung the best.  
He bore his great commission in his look,  
But sweetly tempered awe, and softened all he spoke.  
He preached the joys of heaven, and pains of hell,  
And warned the sinner with becoming zeal ;  
But on eternal mercy loved to dwell.  
He taught the gospel rather than the law,  
And forced himself to drive, but loved to draw.  
For fear but freezes minds ; but love, like heat,  
Exhales the soul sublime, to seek her native seat.”

When at Wells, on the Sundays, twelve poor men or women dined with him in his hall, the bishop always endeavouring, “whilst he fed their bodies, to comfort their spirits by some cheerful discourse, generally mixt with some useful instruction.” And when they had dined, the remainder was divided among them to carry home to their families.

His attention to the numerous poor of Wells was marked at once by tenderness and judgment. The idle and industrious were treated by him in such a manner as was calculated to lead to the amendment of the one and the encouragement of the other.

James the II., notwithstanding the profession which he made upon his accession to the throne, soon shewed his determination, amounting to madness, to overthrow the liberties of his country and, so far as in him lay, that Church of which, though he was not, as ignorant persons assert, the head, he was the sworn protector.

The principles of the clergy were soon severely tested. On the 4th of May, 1688, an order was made by the king in council, directing the archbishops and bishops to distribute through their several dioceses the declaration for liberty of conscience, which was appointed to be published by the clergy in their churches, on the 20th and 27th days of the same month. In this declaration, the king illegally claimed, the power of dispensing with the penal laws against the dissenters; and though this was done under pretence of liberality, it was well known to be intended to favour the Romanists in particular; and it was obviously a blow directed against the Established Church, and against the credit of the clergy.

The bishops were now forced upon the hard alternative of disobeying the command of their sovereign, or of sacrificing their own honour and the interests of the Church, and all principles of law and conscience. In this strait, Archbishop Sancroft called together so many of his suffragans as were in and about London, and some of the more eminent of the clergy of the second throne, to consult on the line of conduct which they ought to pursue. Bishop Ken was among the number who accordingly met; first on the 12th, and again on the 18th of May. After much deliberation, the following petition was prepared, and presented in person, on the same evening, by all the subscribing bishops, except Sancroft, who was forbidden the court from a late displeasure of the king:—

“TO THE KING’S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“The humble petition of William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and of divers of the suffragan bishops of that province, now present with him, in behalf of themselves and others of their absent brethren, and of the clergy of their respective dioceses,

“Humbly sheweth,—



“ That the great averseness they find in themselves to the distributing and publishing in all their churches your Majesty’s late declaration for liberty of conscience, proceedeth neither from any want of duty and obedience to your Majesty, our holy mother the Church of England being, both in her principles and constant practice, unquestionably loyal, and having (to her great honour) been more than once publicly acknowledged to be so by your gracious Majesty; nor yet from any want of due tenderness to dissenters, in relation to whom they are willing to come to such a temper as shall be thought fit, when that matter shall be considered and settled in parliament and convocation: but among many other considerations, from this especially, because that declaration is founded upon such a dispensing power as hath often been declared illegal in parliament, and particularly in the years 1662 and 1672, and in the beginning of your Majesty’s reign; and it is a matter of so great moment and consequence to the whole nation, both in Church and State, that your petitioners cannot, in prudence, honour, or conscience, so far make themselves parties to it, as the distribution of it all over the nation, and the solemn publication of it over and over again in God’s house, and in the time of His divine service, must amount to in common and reasonable construction.

“ Your petitioners, therefore, most humbly and earnestly beseech your Majesty, that you will be graciously pleased not to insist upon their distributing and reading your Majesty’s said declaration.

“ And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c.

“ W. Cant.

W. Asaph.

Fran. Ely.

Jo. Cicestr.

Tho. Bath and Wells.

Tho. Petriburgens.

Jon. Bristol.”

This petition was presented by the bishops on their knees. The king received it with marked displeasure, and called it "a standard of rebellion." The Bishop of Bath and Wells was among those who respectfully, yet firmly, expressed their feelings on the occasion. "Sir," said he, "I hope you will give that liberty to us which you allow to all mankind." On James still insisting that they should publish his declaration, he was answered by Ken in terms at once dutiful and resolute. This serving only to provoke the king to threatening language, the bishop calmly repeated the words, "God's will be done,—God's will be done." And thus they were dismissed from the royal presence.

Of all the rash determinations to which a rash prince ever came, perhaps that of King James to prosecute the seven bishops was the most rash. The cause which they had espoused was already so popular, that many had signed the petition after it was presented, who were not in London when it was prepared: and even in those dioceses whose bishops had sanctioned the declaration for liberty of conscience, the great body of the clergy had refused to publish it. It was only to exasperate this spirit to cite the seven bishops "to appear personally before his majesty in council, upon the 8th day of June next, at five in the afternoon, to answer to such matters of misdemeanour as, on his majesty's behalf, shall be then and there objected against them."

This summons they obeyed; and after a long conversation with the king, for which they had, of course, been prepared by previous consultation and by legal advice, having refused to enter into recognizances, which they held it a breach of privilege to demand, they were committed to the Tower under the following warrant:—

"These are in his majesty's name, and by his command, to require you to take into your custody the

persons of William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; William, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph; Francis, Lord Bishop of Ely; John, Lord Bishop of Chichester; Thomas, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; Thomas, Lord Bishop of Peterborough; and Jonathan, Lord Bishop of Bristol; for contriving, making, and publishing a seditious libel in writing against his majesty and his government; and them safely to keep in your custody until they shall be delivered by due course of law. For which this shall be your sufficient warrant. At the Council-chamber, in Whitehall, this 8th day of June, 1688."

This warrant was signed by the infamous Jeffreys, and eighteen other privy-counsellors.

The trial took place on the 15th of June; and on the following morning the jury returned a verdict of acquittal. The people, who had followed the bishops in crowds to the Tower, imploring their blessing, and who had greeted them with acclamations, and attended them with prayers as they passed by water from the Tower to Westminster Hall—received the verdict with "a wonderful shout," says the Earl of Clarendon, who was present, "that one would have thought the Hall had cracked." The news was communicated rapidly through the city and to the suburbs, and no sign or expression of popular rejoicing was omitted. King James was in his camp at Hounslow, when he was startled by a noise and stir among the soldiers, and asked Lord Feversham what it meant. "It is nothing," said he, "but the soldiers rejoicing at the acquittal of the bishops." "Call you that nothing?" said James; "but so much the worse for them."

The bishops themselves expressed their thankfulness to God, as it became them, in Whitehall Chapel; and as it had been observed before, that at the first service they had attended in the Tower Chapel, one of the lessons of the day, (2 Cor. vi.) was most applicable to



them as sufferers for the Church's sake, so was it now observed that the Epistle, from Acts xii. (it being St. Peter's day,) was equally appropriate.

We cannot follow the king in the hasty steps with which he rushed to the brow of the precipice from which he was about to cast himself; but one feeble effort which he made to arrest his mad progress must be noted, because it brings us again into contact with Bishop Ken. The Archbishop of Canterbury, with several of his suffragans, and Ken among others, were summoned to attend the king on the 28th September. The bishops obeyed the summons; but were ill contented with an interview at which nothing was permitted to them but to express their duty in general terms; and of which no use was made, but politically to represent the king in friendly and confidential communication with them. They demanded therefore, another audience; and on the 3rd of October, presented a memorial to James, in which they recounted the several grievances of the Church and State, and in so many separate articles proposed their cure.

But the demented king was incorrigible in his evil courses, and on the arrival of the Prince of Orange to deliver the nation from papal tyranny, Ken was in favour of the deposition of the tyrant, or rather he accepted the notion that the throne was vacant by the king's flight, but he, with Sancroft, was anxious to establish a regency. He hesitated at first, and then resolved not to take the oaths to William and Mary.

The reader will be gratified in perusing the following statement drawn up by Mrs. Prowse, the daughter of Ken's most intimate friend, Bishop Hooper: she says, "When affairs grew very bad, at the latter part of King James' reign, Dr. Ken, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, between whom and Dr. Hooper there had always been a strict friendship, came up to London, and went to Dr. Hooper's house, at Lambeth, from whence he was

carried to the Tower; and returned thither again, when he and the other six bishops were released from their confinement—the universal joy at which was so great as to be heard at many miles distance; and the shout given in Westminster Hall at their deliverance, to have almost the same effect at Lambeth, upon the windows, as the discharge of a cannon gives.

“Bishop Ken came with the Archbishop of Canterbury in his coach to Lambeth, over London Bridge and through Southwark, which took them up several hours, as the concourse of people was innumerable the whole way, hanging upon the coach, and insisting upon being blessed by those two prelates, who, with much difficulty and patience, at last got to Lambeth House. And he continued with Dr. Hooper till some time after the Revolution, when the submitting to the new government was their usual conversation, which Dr. Hooper earnestly endeavoured to persuade the bishop to; and on parting one night to go to bed, the bishop seemed so well satisfied with the arguments Dr. Hooper had urged to him, that he was inclined to take the oaths. But the next morning he told Dr. Hooper that he had re-considered what had passed the evening before, and that he was afraid to proceed, for fear of making himself for ever unhappy, or to that effect. ‘But,’ says he, ‘Dr. Hooper, I am well satisfied that you take them with as clear and well-resolved conscience, as I refuse them.’ Upon which the Dr. said he never could mention the subject any more to him, for God forbid he should take them.”

Bishop Ken, by his refusal to transfer his allegiance to the new sovereigns, incurred, with several others of his brethren, the penalty of immediate suspension, and of deprivation ultimately;—so far, that is, as an act of parliament can suspend or deprive ecclesiastics; and they were all, except the Bishops of Worcester, Chichester, and Chester, who died before

the process of law had run, forcibly expelled from their sees.

Between the sentence of suspension and that of deprivation six months intervened, to which indulgence there was no parallel in the treatment of any but the clergy. Indeed, it is not to be denied, that the greatest indulgence which circumstances would admit was afforded to the bishops. But justice had been set aside, and so lenity lost its grace; and even impunity would have been a boon scarcely to be accepted. Yet the bishops insisted not on the justice of their cause, so much as on the incompetence of the authority to which they were forced to bend. They would doubtless have submitted to harder measures, even to degradation itself, if it had been dealt to them through the arm of the Church. It was their unhappiness to be placed at issue with the civil power, by principles which they dare not sacrifice, and which even their enemies must respect. They refused not to suffer any loss or deprivation which the state could lawfully inflict; but they were ecclesiastics, and held a trust which the state had not committed to them, and could not remit. It was on these grounds that they still challenged the title and claimed the office of bishops, as theirs by right, in their several sees.

Ken, after his expulsion from Wells, retired to Long-Leat, the princely domain of his ancient college acquaintance, the Lord Viscount Weymouth; having first, from his pastoral chair in his cathedral, publicly asserted his canonical right, professing that he esteemed himself the canonical bishop of the diocese, and that he would be ready, on all occasions, to perform his pastoral duties.

The retirement of Bishop Ken was once only disturbed by any formal process of the state. A paper had been signed by the deprived bishops, soliciting alms for the non-juring clergy; and something or other



in the form of this paper giving umbrage to the court, Bishop Ken was examined before the privy council upon the subject. The objection urged against him was, that the paper came out with a pretence of authority, and was illegal, being of the nature of a brief; and that if such practices were permitted, private men might supersede all the briefs granted by the king. The bishop's plea was simply, that his act was one of charity, that he could plead only to the evangelical part, but, being no lawyer, was unable to answer it in law; and that as for any assumption of jurisdiction, begging was no part of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and that in that paper they were only beggars. This plea seems to have been so far admitted, that Ken was allowed to retire, and was no more molested.

Bishop Ken's successor in the cathedral of Wells was Bishop Kidder; a latitudinarian in principle, but so far as we know, a man of personal good character. The worst we know of him is, that after long opposition on his own part, he at last, at the entreaty of the queen, accepted the see, which he knew was not canonically vacant. His conscience seems to have reproached him often for this proceeding; and we cannot but apply in such cases the Divine warning, "Brethren, if your heart condemn you, God is greater than your heart, and knoweth all things:" but we must surely pause before we pronounce Bishop Kidder's melancholy fate a judgment upon him for his obtrusion into Ken's see; and yet the narrow escape of Ken himself from the same violent death gives a remarkable character of providential interference to the whole of the circumstances. They were as follows:—In 1703, a tremendous storm, which did much damage at Wells, and at many other places, threw down a stack of chimneys in that part of the palace where Bishop Kidder and his wife lay, and buried them both in the ruins: no other person in Wells was injured. On the same night, Bishop

Ken being at Salisbury, his nephew's house, in which he was, was so damaged, that, to borrow his own words, "the house being surveyed the day following, the workmen found that the beam which supported the roof over my head was broken out to that degree, that it had but half an inch to hold; that it was a wonder it would hold together; for which signal and particular preservation God's holy name be ever praised."

On the death of Bishop Kidder, Queen Anne sent for the Bishop of St. Asaph, Ken's friend, Dr. Hooper, and offered to translate him to Bath and Wells. For an account of what transpired, we are again indebted to Mrs. Prowse:—"Dr. Hooper expressed his thanks to her majesty, but begged to be excused, as he could by no means eat the bread of so old a friend as Bishop Ken had been to him (who was deprived of that see by King William,) and entreated her majesty's leave to propose to her the restoring him to his bishopric again. This the queen highly approved of, and thanked the bishop for putting her in mind of it, and ordered him to propose it to Bishop Ken. This offer was received with great acknowledgment by that pious good man, who desired Bishop Hooper to return his most grateful thanks to the queen for her gracious remembrance of him; but that he could not return into the business of the world again, but would ever beseech God to accumulate the blessings of both upon her. But in the same letter he expressed his great satisfaction at the offer Bishop Hooper had, and how freely he would resign all title to the bishopric to him, and how much he rejoiced that his strayed sheep would be reduced under his government; desiring him to accept it, which he could not think of doing, as he told the queen and bishop both, being extremely averse to it for many reasons. But he was obliged again to remove as much against his will as his first removal into a bishopric; for Bishop Ken sent him a letter full of

those primitive strains which were in all his writings, in which he charged him, as he would answer it at the great day, to take the charge of his flock, with more to the same purpose; and the queen at the same time insisting upon the taking of it, he was forced to comply. For it was still necessary, for the satisfaction of those who wanted either his preferments or his absence, to send him to Wells. However, when he submitted himself to her majesty's commands, he told her he must presume to do it upon one condition, which he begged leave to mention, and that was, that he might keep the chanterhip of Exeter in commendam, which was £200 a year, which he would constantly pay to Bishop Ken, or else no consideration whatever could make him take his bishopric, and that she would be pleased to give him her royal dispensation for residence, not that he might be excused doing his duty, but that he might not be compelled to it. This the queen was extremely pleased with, and thanked Bishop Hooper for putting her in mind of it, and accordingly the dispensation was granted."

After mentioning a dispute between Hooper and Bishop Trelawney, as to the former holding the above mentioned "chanterhip," the writer proceeds:—

"As Bishop Hooper was not to be moved from his resolution, and Bishop Trelawney grew too warm to be denied, my Lord T. [the Lord Treasurer Godolphin] was forced to have recourse to the queen, who sent to the Bishop of Bath and Wells to come to her, when she told him that it would be for her service if he would resign the grant she gave him, and that Bishop Ken should be no loser, as he should have £200 a year constantly paid to him out of the treasury. To this the bishop instantly submitted, and thought it was more advantageous to Bishop Ken to depend upon the queen's life for this pension, than upon his for the chanterhip, as the queen was younger than himself,



though it pleased God to take her majesty fourteen years before him; yet she survived Bishop Ken, to whom it was honourably and constantly paid every year by Mr. Taylor of the treasury to Bishop Hooper, who as soon as he appeared there, had it immediately put into his hand, rolled up in paper, for he never waited longer than to receive Bishop Ken's compliments and acknowledgments to him for the exactness of the payment. And to do justice to this gentleman, it is right to say, that when Bishop Hooper offered one day to make him a present of fifty guineas, ready done up to put in his hands, as from Bishop Ken (who knew nothing of it,) he would not by any means take it, but with tears said, 'God forbid he should ever take any thing from that good man, for he was but doing his duty.'

"When Bishop Ken was deprived, the whole of his fortune was but £800, which the then Lord Weymouth took, and was to allow him either £60 or £80 a year for it, I cannot remember which, and he was to make Long-Leat his home as long as he lived, which he always looked upon as such; but was very frequently at many other places for a considerable part of his time, particularly Mrs. Thynne's, at Leweston, Mrs. Keymis', Archdeacon Sandys', and the Palace at Wells, who all thought themselves happy to have him under their roof. He was so charitable as to give away more than he could spare, so that *his habit was mean, and a poor-horse to carry him about*, which made Bishop Hooper entreat him that he would not give every thing away, which the bishop *promised to lay out upon himself for the future, and from that time he appeared in every thing according to his condition*. Bishop Ken died several years before Bishop Hooper, and just before he died, would fain have given his servant a message for him, but could not make himself understood, any more than that he mentioned his best friend."

It is to be remarked in favour of the sound understanding and high principles of Bishop Ken, that the lengths to which the Non-jurors went in after times, did not receive countenance or support from him. He would not concur with those who were anxious to perpetuate a division amongst the members of the Church, for when some of the most distinguished of the Non-jurors applied to him as a leader, on the death of Bishop Lloyd, "he refused to challenge their obedience as a Catholic bishop, or to head their communion."

During his retirement at Long-Leat, Bishop Ken composed a large proportion of his poetical works, which, however, were not published till 1721, eleven years after his decease. He is chiefly remembered as a poet for the morning and evening hymns which are often bound up in our Prayer Books, and with which every English churchman has been long familiar.

The time was now come when Bishop Ken was to exhibit in his death the same bright example which his life had afforded; and those around him might have said, "See how a Christian can die!" Being attacked by a painful internal complaint, he went to Bristol in the beginning of 1710, where he staid until the following November.

Thence he removed to the seat of the Hon. Mrs. Thynne, Leweston, in Dorsetshire, where he was seized with palsy. Hoping for relief from the Bath waters, he quitted her house in March, calling at Long-Leat on his way, where he adjusted some papers, but never left that mansion alive, as he died about ten days after his arrival, viz. on the 19th of March, 1710 (O.S.) He was "remarkably patient," says his biographer, "and desired that no applications might be made to cause him to linger in pain."

The following particulars of his death, gleaned from a letter of Ambrose Bonwicke, will be read with interest,

as written not only by a contemporary, but as evincing in a very young man a deep reverential feeling for departed worth. Speaking of the death of the master of his college, (St. John's, Cambridge,) on the previous day, he says, "Thus it has pleased God to take to Himself from us, a man indeed too good for us, as He had a little before a better. For to night being in Mr. Roper's chamber, 'Before you begin to read,' says he, 'you shall hear a letter, in which I have an account of the death of Bishop Ken. He died as he lived, a plain humble man.' He came hither, (to my Lord Weymouth's,) on the 9th, in Mrs. Thynne's coach, at whose seat he had been all the winter, designing for the Bath on the 12th, but was hindered by the return of his illness. He had two physicians from the Bath and the Devizes, and desired to know their opinion of his condition, for he was not, he said, at all afraid to die, and therefore desired that they would tell him the truth. Upon their saying there was but small hopes, he replied, God's will be done! and so died the 19th; leaving order in his will to be buried in the church-yard of the nearest parish in his diocese, soon after sun-rising, very privately; to be carried by the six poorest men in the parish, and to have laid over him a plain stone, with an inscription on it of his own composing, which the writer did not yet know. He was, according to his order, buried on Wednesday morning, the 21st, at Frome."

"As for my religion," says Bishop Ken, in his will, "I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolical Faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly I die in the communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all papal and puritan innovation, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross."

His works have been collected and published by the



Rev. James Thomas Round, who has, apparently with justice, excluded *The Retired Christian*, an excellent work, though not Bishop Ken's.—*Hawkins. Life prefixed to the Practice of Divine Love. Life by Markland. Bowles.*

## KENNEDY, JAMES.

JAMES KENNEDY was the younger of two sons of James Kennedy, of Dunnure, by the Lady Mary, the Countess of Angus, daughter of Robert III., King of Scotland. He was born in 1405 or 1406, and receiving his primary education at home, completed his studies in some of the continental universities. In 1437, he was preferred by James I. to the see of Dunkeld.

Soon after Kennedy was settled in his bishopric of Dunkeld, he set himself to reform abuses; and that he might obtain sufficient authority for this purpose, he undertook a journey to Italy. But at that time Pope Eugenius IV., having his attention otherwise occupied, could not give him all the assistance he required; but he bestowed on him the vacant abbacy of Scone; and when Bishop Wardlaw died, which happened before he quitted Italy, he confirmed his translation to the see of St. Andrews.

In 1444, he was made chancellor of the kingdom; but finding that this involved him in more arduous duties than he could conscientiously perform, he soon after resigned that office.

The *Rotuli Scotiæ* show a safe-conduct to this bishop through England to Rome, in 1446, with thirty persons; another in 1456, to England, with the Bishop of Brechin, the Abbot of Melrose, and one hundred persons; and a third, in 1463, to England, and other parts of the English dominions, with the Bishop of Glasgow, the Abbott of Holyrood, the Lord Privy Seal, several noblemen, and a suite of two hundred persons,

for the purpose of concluding a treaty of peace with Edward IV.

His labours as a diplomatist and statesman do not fall under the province of this work. But soon after his return home he commenced the work which has made his name famous. He founded at St. Andrew's, the College of St. Galvator's, which he liberally endowed for the maintenance of thirteen persons in all, (*ad instaurum apostolici numeri*;) namely a provost, a licentiate, and a bachelor, who should all be in orders, and lectures on theology on certain days in the week, four masters of arts and six *pauperes clerici*, or persons in inferior orders. He founded also the Collegiate Church within the precincts of the college, in which is his tomb, of exquisite workmanship; a few years ago, six magnificent silver maces were discovered within the tomb, exact models of it. One was presented to each of the three other Scotch universities, and three are preserved in the college. He founded also the Abbey of the Observantines, which was finished by his successor, Bishop Graham, in 1478, but is now a ruin. During the minority of James III. he was appointed one of the lords of the regency, but in fact was allowed the whole power, and, according to Buchanan and Spotswood, conducted himself with great prudence. He died May 10, 1466, and was interred in his Collegiate Church. In his private character he was frugal, but magnificent in his expenses for the promotion of religion and learning. He is said to have written some political advices, "*Monita Politica*," and a History of his own times, both probably lost.—*Lyon's St. Andrews. Mackenzie. Crawford. Keith's Scottish Bishops.*

#### KENNET WHITE.

THIS prelate, who was a violent and not very scrupu-

lous partizan of the Whigs, is chiefly known for his historical labours. He collected many materials, but had not the philosophy and depth of thought which are necessary to make a good historian. Of his labours superior minds have been able to avail themselves. He was born at Dover, in 1660, and had his name, White, from his mother's father, who was a magistrate of that town. He received his education at Westminster School, and went from thence to St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, where he took his master's degree, in 1684, and the same year was presented to the vicarage of Ambrosden, in Oxfordshire. In 1689, as he was shooting, the gun burst, and wounded him in the forehead, so that he was ever after obliged to wear a patch of black velvet. After this he became vice-principal of St. Edmund Hall; and in 1693, was presented to the rectory of Shottesbrooke, in Berkshire. In 1699, he took his doctor's degree, and the next year obtained the living of St. Botolph, Aldgate. He now became popular among the low Church party, and had a controversy with Atterbury, respecting the rights of Convocation. In 1706, he was employed by the booksellers to superintend a collection of English historians, and to continue the work, of which a second edition appeared in 1719, in 3 vols. folio. He made himself conspicuous by a funeral sermon preached for the first Duke of Devonshire, in 1707, which gave great offence, as an apology for the sins of the great. The same year he was made dean of Peterborough; but so obnoxious had he now made himself by his party zeal, that Welton, the rector of Whitechapel, caused his portrait to be exhibited in the character of Judas, in the altar-piece of that church. This act of indecency was properly resented, and the painting removed. In 1718, he was made Bishop of Peterborough. He died in 1728. The bishop was an able antiquary, and particularly conversant in the northern languages. His principal works are:—1. Parochial Anti-



quities, attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, and other adjacent parts, 1695, 4to. Of this there has been a new edition lately published at Oxford. 2. Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of England, 8vo. 3. The History of the Convocation, 4to. 4. The Case of Impropriations and of the augmentation of Vicarages, 8vo. 5. Account of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 4to. 6. The Register and Chronicle, folio.

His life has been written at some length by Newton, but is not worth the perusal, though the following extract from a letter by Kennet, will be read with interest. Describing to an American friend the state of England in 1716, and the increase of Jacobite opinions, he says "The people in this ferment were disposed to read and admire the daily pamphlets, thrown about to reconcile them more and more to Popery, under pretences of divine and hereditary rights, uninterrupted succession, independent state of the Church, the expediency and even necessity of private confession, the immediate effects of sacerdotal absolution, the invalidity of baptism out of episcopal communion, a priest, an altar, a real sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, a middle state of souls, no harm, at least, in prayers for the dead, and many other devices, approaching as near to Rome as present shame and safety would admit. All which conceits you well know, sprung as tares of the enemy, long after our blessed Reformation, and I think never appeared until the beginning of the civil wars, under the influence of a court that had too much of the popish queen in it, and were now revived to serve no other purpose but that of the interest of a popish impostor. Only there was some difference in the times; for before those civil wars, none ran into those notions but some of the warmer and ambitious clergy; whereas now the common people and the very women had their heads full of them.

“Under these delusions a multitude have been given up to believe the idol at Avignon to be something, and worthy to be set up; given up, alas! to any lies, and to the practice of many popish superstitions. Some would not go to their seats in the church until they had kneeled and prayed at the rails of the communion table; they would not be content to receive the Sacrament there kneeling, but with prostration and striking of the breast, and kissing of the ground, as if there were an host to be adored; they began to think the Common Prayer without a sermon (at least afternoon) to be the best way of serving God; and churches without organs had the thinner congregations; bidding of prayer was thought better than praying to God, and even pictures about the altar began to be the books of the vulgar; the meeting-houses of Protestant dissenters were thought to be more defiled places than popish chapels: in short, the herd of people were running towards Rome without any foresight, or power of looking backward.”—*Life by Newton.*

## KENNET, BASIL.

BASIL KENNET, younger brother of the bishop, was born in 1674. He was educated for the same profession at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which he became a fellow in 1697. Through the interest of his brother, he was made chaplain to the English factory at Leghorn, a situation which exposed him to some danger from the power of the inquisition. Orders were issued for his imprisonment; but the remonstrances of Lord Sunderland, the secretary of state, secured his freedom, and he retained his post till ill health obliged him to return home. He died soon after at Oxford, in 1714. A little before his death, he finished the preface to a volume, which came out under the title of “Sermons

on several occasions, preached before the Society of British Merchants in foreign Parts." Lond. 1715, 8vo.

Besides this collection, he published English Translations of eminent authors, the chief of which are as follows:—1. "Puffendorf on the Law of Nature and Nations." 2. "Placette's Christian Casuist." 3. "Godeau's Pastoral Instructions." 4. "Pascal's Thoughts on Religion." To which he prefixed an account of the manner in which those thoughts were delivered by the author. 5. "Balsac's Aristippus; with an Account of his Life and Writings." 6. "The Marriage of Thames and Isis;" from a Latin poem of Mr. Camden. But he was chiefly celebrated for his treatise on Roman Antiquities, which, though now superseded by later and more accurate works, was much esteemed in its day.—*Newton's Life of Bishop Kennet. Gen. Biog.*

#### KENNICOTT, BENJAMIN.

BENJAMIN KENNICOTT was born on the 4th of April 1718, at Totness, in Devonshire, where his father officiated as parish clerk. Young Kennicott at an early period of life was made master of the Charity School of his native place, a situation at one time filled by his father.

While he was in this situation, in the year 1743 he wrote some verses on the recovery of the Hon. Mrs. Elizabeth Courtenay from her late dangerous illness, which, if they cannot be said to possess any high poetical merit, discover talents which deserved better cultivation than his humble sphere could afford; of this, the lady to whom they were addressed was fully sensible, as were several of the neighbouring gentry and clergy, who generously opened a subscription, in order to procure for him the advantages of academical education. Thus patronized, in the year 1744 he entered Wadham



College, in the University of Oxford; where he soon distinguished himself in that department of study in which he afterwards became so eminent. While he was yet an undergraduate, he commenced his career in sacred criticism, by publishing "Two Dissertations: the first on the Tree of Life in Paradise, with some Observations on the Creation and Fall of Man; the second on the Oblation of Cain and Abel," 8vo. These Dissertations were so favourably received that they came to a second edition, in the year 1747; and they also procured for the author the honour of having the degree of B.A. conferred on him by the university, a year before the usual time, and without paying the customary fees. This favour was conferred upon him to enable him to stand for a fellowship at Exeter College, to which he was soon after elected. When he was of sufficient standing, he took the degree of M.A.; but before that time, if we are not mistaken, he had been admitted into holy orders. It is said that when he first came to officiate in his clerical capacity at his native place, and his father, as clerk, was proceeding to put the surplice on his shoulders, a struggle ensued between the modesty of the son, and the honest pride of the parent, who insisted on paying his son the same respect that he had been accustomed to shew to other clergymen; in which filial obedience was obliged to submit. A circumstance is added, that his mother had often declared that she should never be able to support the joy of hearing her son preach; and that on her attendance at this time, she was so overcome, as to be taken out in a state of temporary insensibility.

In the year 1753, and in 1759, he laid the foundation of his great work by the publication of two dissertations, the object of which, (says Mr. Horne, from whom the following remarks are taken,) was to shew the necessity of the same extensive collation of Hebrew manuscripts as had already been undertaken for the Greek manu-

scripts. The utility of the proposed collation being generally admitted, a very liberal subscription was made to defray the expense of the collation, amounting on the whole to nearly ten thousand pounds, and the name of his late majesty headed the list of subscribers. Various persons were employed, both at home and abroad; but of the foreign literati, the principal was Professor Bruns, of the University of Helmstadt, who not only collated Hebrew manuscripts in Germany, but went for that purpose into Italy and Switzerland. The business of collation continued from 1760 to 1769 inclusive, during which period Dr. Kennicott published annually an account of the progress which was made. More than six hundred Hebrew manuscripts, and sixteen manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch, were discovered in different libraries in England and on the continent: many of which were wholly collated, and others consulted in important passages. Several years of course elapsed, after the collations were finished, before the materials could be arranged and digested for publication. The variations contained in nearly seven hundred bundles of papers, being at length digested (including the collations made by Professor Bruns) and the whole when put together, being corrected by the original collations, and then fairly transcribed into thirty folio volumes, the work was put to press in 1773. In 1776, the first volume of Dr. Kennicott's Hebrew Bible was delivered to the public, and in 1780 the second volume. It was printed at the Clarendon press, and the University of Oxford has the honour of having produced the first critical edition upon a large scale both of the Greek Testament and of the Hebrew Bible—an honour which it is still maintaining by a similar edition, hitherto indeed unfinished, of the Greek version, commenced by the late Rev. Dr. Holmes, and now continuing under the editorial care of the Rev. Dr. Parsons.

The text of Kennicott's edition was printed from that of Van der Hooght, with which the Hebrew manuscripts, by Dr. Kennicott's directions, were all collated. But, as variations in the points were disregarded in the collation, the points were not added in the text. The various readings, as in the critical editions of the Greek Testament, were printed at the bottom of the page, with references to the correspondent readings of the text. In the Pentateuch the deviations of the Samaritan text were printed in a column parallel to the Hebrew; and the variations observable in the Samaritan manuscripts, which differ from each other as well as the Hebrew, are likewise noted with references to the Samaritan *printed* text. To this collation of manuscripts was added a collation of the most distinguished editions of the Hebrew Bible, in the same manner as Weststein has noted the variations observable in the principal editions of the Greek Testament. Nor did Kennicott confine his collation to manuscripts and editions. He further considered, that, as the quotations from the Greek Testament in the works of ecclesiastical writers, afford another source of various readings, so the quotations from the Hebrew Bible in the words of Jewish writers are likewise subjects of critical inquiry. For this purpose he had recourse to the most distinguished among the rabbinical writings, but particularly to the Talmud, the text of which is as ancient as the third century. In the quotation of his authorities, he designates them by numbers from 1 to 692, including manuscripts, editions, and rabbinical writings, which numbers are explained in the *Dissertatio Generalis*, annexed to the second volume.

This *Dissertatio Generalis*, which corresponds to what are called *Prolegomena* in other critical editions, contains, not only an account of the manuscripts, and other authorities collated for this edition, but also a review of the Hebrew text divided into periods, and



beginning with the formation of the Hebrew canon after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity. Though inquiries of this description unavoidably contain matters of doubtful disputation, though the opinions of Kennicott have been frequently questioned, and sometimes justly questioned, his *Dissertatio Generalis* is a work of great interest to every biblical scholar. Kennicott was a disciple of Cappellus, both in respect to the integrity of the Hebrew text, and in respect to the preference of the Samaritan Pentateuch: but he avoided the extreme, into which Morinus and Houbigant had fallen. And though he professed not the rabbinical learning of the two Buxtorfs, his merits were greater than some of his contemporaries, as well in England as on the continent, were willing to allow." For a very copious account of Dr. Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible, see the *Monthly Review* (O.S.), vol. lv. pp. 92-100; vol. lxiv. pp. 173-182, 321-328; vol. lxv. pp. 121-131.

He was involved in controversy, as a matter of course, on the subject of his studies, and had some eminent divines among his opponents. Into an account of these it is no part of our present plan to enter. He took his degree of D.D., in 1761, having previously been presented to the vicarage of Culham, in Oxfordshire. A pension of £200 was bestowed upon him by the king as some remuneration for his labours. In 1767, he obtained the office of keeper of the Radcliffe Library; and in June, 1770, he was presented to a prebendal stall in Westminster Abbey, which he exchanged for a canonry of Christ Church, Oxford, in the October following. In 1771, he married, and with his wife, continued to live in much domestic happiness till August 18th, 1783, when his valuable life was brought to a close. In 1787, a posthumous work appeared, "Remarks on select Passages in the Old Testament, to which are added eight Sermons." The printing of

a portion of the volume had been completed before his death; the whole was published under a direction in his will by the Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Barrington, the Rev. Mr. Cyril Jackson, and the Rev. Mr. Cracherode.—*Monthly Mag. European Mag. Gentleman's Mag. Horne's Introduction.*

## KETTLEWELL, JOHN.

JOHN KETTLEWELL, the son of John and Elizabeth Kettlewell, was born on the 10th of March, 1653, at the village of Brompton, in the parish of North-Allerton, Yorkshire. He was educated at the Free School, at North-Allerton, under Mr. Thomas Smelt, and in the year 1670, he was admitted to St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, through the interest of the principal. At college he was distinguished for piety, industry, and virtue, which qualities (together with their having been educated at the same school,) introduced him to the notice of Dr. Hickee, afterwards Dean of Worcester, to whose exertions and interest he was greatly indebted, in obtaining a fellowship at Lincoln College.

Mr. Kettlewell was made master of arts, in 1677. He now applied himself in good earnest to the duties of his several callings, and composed a great number of sermons, which are said to have been written in a plain and unadorned style, more fit for a country parish than for the learned congregations of Oxford, by which we may infer, that he aimed at becoming what he afterwards was in such great perfection, a country parson. In 1658, he wrote his "Measures of Christian Obedience," and dedicated the same to the Bishop of London, Dr. Compton. This dedication he afterwards cancelled, when the prelate appeared armed at the head of a troop of northern gentlemen, against his own prince, with the

pretence of legal rights and the goodly motto, "*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari,*" on his standard.

The Dowager Countess of Bedford made Kettlewell her chaplain, and in this situation he was called upon to assert his principles in a way, which to a man of his meek and quiet spirit, must have been most painful. Lord Russell is well known to have maintained that it was lawful to arm against the invasion of our religious and civil rights. Kettlewell on the contrary thought that no pretended invasion of legal rights and liberties, whether civil or ecclesiastical, could be sufficient warrant to arm against the Sovereign powers. These differences brought about by the existing party feuds, did not prevent Lord Russell from feeling the highest esteem and respect for Kettlewell, which he testified by sending him a message from the scaffold, as a token of remembrance.

In 1682, Kettlewell was presented by Simon, Lord Digby, to the vicarage of Coleshill, in Warwick, and we find in the register of that parish, that he read the thirty-nine Articles, and declared his "unfeigned assent and consent to the Common Prayer," after having performed morning and evening service, on the 10th of December in the same year. Kettlewell being now settled in his parish, it will be useful to consider the method he took to carry out the rules of the Church in it, and to shew how he inculcated Christian faith and obedience. He preached twice on every Sunday, and once on all occasional days; particularly such as Good Friday, the 30th of January, and the 29th of May: he began to catechise in Lent, and continued to do so for several Sundays after. On Sunday afternoons he performed this exercise, asking questions to try the understanding, but more especially the Christian's heart and practice: and when he afterwards went into the pulpit, he chose a text suitable to the matter on which he had been catechising, which method he found both acceptable and edifying to his congregation. He had



an excellent catechetical method, in which he took great pains with himself; and he was very earnest in recommending it to all who had the cure of souls. With this view he wrote his "Practical Believer," which consisted of Lectures on the Creed, or familiar instructions for a Christian catechumen, upon all the several articles of Christian faith as reducible to practice.

He always administered the Holy Communion on Christmas-day, Good Friday, Easter-day, the Sunday after, and Whit-Sunday; and several times of the year besides. He admonished his parishioners frequently from the pulpit for their negligent performance of this part of their duty, and took great pains with them also in private. He administered the sacrament of baptism strictly according to the rubric, particularly insisting upon the children being brought to church, unless it was not safe to do so. He was a religious observer of all the festivals of the Church, which had been much neglected in his parish before his time; as indeed they were generally throughout the kingdom. He observed likewise the days of fasting and humiliation, both those enjoined by the Church and those appointed by civil authority. He abstained from flesh every Wednesday and Friday in Lent: he failed not to bid all public holy-days, and had prayers both upon them and their eves; also upon all Saturday afternoons, he visited the sick—assisting them temporally as well as spiritually; and he dispensed books of religion and devotion among the poor, who were all, in a short time supplied with Bibles and Whole Duties of Man, and other books, according to their several needs. Mr. Kettlewell's parochial arrangements are given at some length, as being instructive, to shew the internal vigour and strength of the Church in an age, when, left to herself, she was assailed by open enemies, and undermined by the lukewarmness of professing friends.

On the accession of King James II., the same

persons, who, in the late king's reign, were desirous of excluding him from the throne, now began most industriously to attempt his deposition, and every means were taken to raise the alarm of Popery. This was notwithstanding the assurance of the king, upon ascending the throne, that he would preserve inviolate the rights and prerogatives of the crown, and would uphold the government in Church and State; he also added some complimentary allusions to the members of the Church of England, for always shewing themselves good and loyal subjects. But this alarm of Popery soon roused the clergy of London, and the city pulpits began to ring with satires against the court religion, which could not fail of being very odious to the king and his party. Kettlewell took this state of things gravely into consideration, and thought the proper method of securing the Church of England from the dangers of which so many were apprehensive, was strictly to adhere to the principles of the Church, both by word and deed, and accordingly, (to use the words of his biographer) he was not so much for skirmishing with the enemy after their manner, whatever applause they might gain by it, as he was for laying the foundation firm in the first place, and then for building a good superstructure upon it, and such as might be able to stand all the storms from any power of hell or the world; therefore he preached up more constantly the duties of common Christianity and of universal obligation, of reliance upon Providence, of simplicity and sincerity, of fidelity and perseverance, with all the branches of the great doctrine of the cross, and the benefit the Church maketh by sufferings, constantly recommending Christianity to his flock, as a passive religion, and giving them rules for begetting in them a meek and passive spirit.

On the 4th of October, 1685, he married Miss Jane Lybb, the daughter of an Oxfordshire gentleman. As a married man, Mr. Kettlewell was, as in every other

relation of life, a pattern of what a Christian ought to be. He was the kindest and tenderest of husbands, and though Mrs. Kettlewell, during the time of their residence at Coleshill, had very indifferent health, yet he was known to say, when their troubles had come on them, "that he blessed God that when He gave them a travelling cause, He also gave her a travelling body;" and she was afterwards enabled to bear the increased fatigues and hardships they had to undergo without prejudice to her constitution.

In the first year of King James's reign the Lord Digby presented a new set of communion plate to his parish church of Coleshill, which was consecrated by Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury; and as the particulars of this consecration are curious and well-worthy of note and imitation, they will be given here in the words of Mr. Kettlewell's friend, Dean HICKES. The plate was placed upon a table, below the steps of the altar, before the beginning of divine service; and immediately after the Nicene Creed, and the first sentence of the offertory, Mr. Kettlewell, the presenter of the plate, in the name of the donor, officiating as parish priest, under his metropolitan, came forth, and stood between the said table, and the altar. Then after humble adoration made to Almighty God, and his obeisance to the bishop, he humbly desired that the vessels there before him, prepared for the use of that Church, by his worthy and noble patron, (being a paten, two chalices, a flagon, and a bason) might be, by him presented to Almighty God, and consecrated to His service, according to the donor's intention. Whereupon the archbishop, after an answer of approbation and a devout invocation of the holy Name of God, in terms very pathetic and appropriate to the occasion, standing before the midst of the altar, did receive in the Name of God, from the hands of the presenter kneeling, each piece of plate separately, and place it upon the Altar decently spread; several



sentences of Scripture, adapted to the offering of each of them, alternately repeated as he was thus placing them, and praying over the same; which being ended, then followed the prayer of consecration, which was after this form:—

“Unto Thee, O ever blessed Lord and Saviour, and to Thy most holy worship and service, do I here offer up and dedicate these oblations, (here he laid his hands upon every piece of the plate,) which in humble acknowledgment of Thy sovereignty over all, and of Thy infinite mercy and goodness to him in particular, Thy pious and devout servant, hath here presented before Thee. But who is he, O Lord, that should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? Thine, O Lord, is the power, and the glory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine. Both riches and honour and all things come of Thee: and it is of Thine own that he hath given Thee. Accept, we beseech Thee, these his free-will offerings, and grant that they may be for ever holy vessels for the use of Thy sanctuary. Let no profane or sacrilegious hand ever withdraw them from Thine altar, or debase them to common use again; but let them continue always inviolable in that holy service to which they have been by him so piously designed, and are now, by our office and ministry, solemnly set apart and consecrated. And sanctify, we beseech Thee, both the souls and bodies of all those who out of these holy vessels shall now, or at any time hereafter partake of the Holy Communion of Thy most blessed Body and Blood; that we may be all filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and also pardoned and accepted, and everlastingly rewarded through Thy mercy, O ever blessed Lord and Saviour, Who dost live and govern all things, world without end. Amen.”

After which, the archbishop added this benediction following: “And now, blessed be Thou, O Lord, hea-

venly Father, Almighty and everlasting God, for ever and ever; and blessed be Thy great and glorious Name that it hath pleased Thee to put into the heart of Thy servant to give so freely for the more decent performance of Thy worship and service in the beauty of holiness. Accept, O Lord, this his bounden duty and service, not weighing his merits but pardoning his offences. Let these, his oblations, come up as a memorial before Thee, and let him find and feel that with such sacrifices Thou art well pleased. Bless him, O Lord, in his person and in his substance, and in all that belongs to him, or that he puts his hands unto. Remember him, oh my God, for good, and wipe not out the kindnesses that he hath done for the House of his God, and the offices thereof; and give to all those that shall enjoy this, his piety and bounty, both a grateful sense and sanctified use of what is by him so well intended; that in all and by all, Thy praise and glory may now and ever be set forth, O gracious and merciful Lord, Who livest and reignest ever one God, world without end. Amen."

Then the archbishop went on with the other sentences in the offertory, and bread and wine in the new vessels were now placed on the table, and the alms gathered in the new bason, and the order for the administration of the Holy Communion was proceeded in, and so the solemnity ended.

This service brought down upon Mr. Kettlewell the prevalent Popery cry, but for this he did not concern himself, as he observed that the Church of England was just at that time in a flourishing condition. The number of converts to the religion of the king was very inconsiderable, and a number of conscientious dissenters, who perceived by the arguments and writings of the clergy, that they not only opposed Popery, but possessed the only true reasons against it, returned to the Church from which they had separated.

The edict of the king for liberty of conscience caused a great sensation, not only among all kinds of dissenters, whether Popish or Protestant, but among churchmen, who thought they saw great and imminent dangers to their cause, in thus forming a coalition of sects and parties against the Church. This irritation and alarm shewed itself in a manner not calculated to allay the danger, or to quell the apprehensions. The violence of some, especially among the London clergy, was such as to cause the king to reprint a set of directions to the clergy, originally set forth by Charles II., (but under far different circumstances) restraining them in the matter of their discourses, and exhorting them not to preach anything but the pure word of God, and to abstain from subjects which would only lead their hearers to disobedience, schism, and rebellion. That Mr. Kettlewell acted in a way not to fall under these censures, need hardly be stated. Never was he known either to handle the deep points of God's eternal councils and decrees, or to meddle with the affairs of states and government, but in a manner calculated to instil some important point of practical faith.

The way in which the king exercised his prerogative, and assumed the supremacy, caused the greatest commotions and jealousies; and although it is well known that he was at this time surrounded by evil councillors, who were advising him to his ruin, yet in his name were set forth many orders and decrees, and which, far from quieting, only tended to increase the disturbances. The declaration of liberty of conscience was ordered to be read by the clergy in their several churches; whereupon seven of the bishops petitioned the king to annul so oppressive an order. This petition caused great indignation in the royal council, and after undergoing a strict and severe examination before his majesty, the seven prelates were sent to the Tower, from whence



they were subsequently liberated, after a triumphant acquittal.

It is well known that this persecution of the seven bishops was only the beginning of sorrows, for although in their loyalty for him who had dealt so unjustly by them, the bishops upheld the royal authority by every means in their power, and though they issued prayers "to be used in the time of public apprehension from the danger of invasion," yet their endeavours could not avert the consequence of his most abused power and illegal sway. James the Second withdrew from the country, and the Prince of Orange was elected to the royal authority under the name of William III. Then came the question of the oath of allegiance to the new sovereign, to which five of the bishops gave an absolute denial, and although time was given them to solve the weighty question, yet they finally refused to do so. But there were many persons who justified themselves in taking these oaths without altering their principles, by the leave which they said King James had given them, to act as occasion should require, and not to throw themselves out of a position of usefulness, and a capacity for doing business, when opportunity should occur.

To this argument Kettlewell was quite averse, he used to say, "If we would do good either to Church or State, to do this wisely we must do it under God, and not by setting up against Him. And whensoever He calls us to the profession of a necessary truth, or the practice of a necessary duty, His call must be our season, and we are only to discern and take it."

He took a great deal of pains to be clear in the business of the new oath, reading what was written, and hearing what could be said on both sides, with all possible care and sedateness. And when he satisfied himself, he was ready always to deliver his opinion to any of his brethren who consulted him; and when

several of them went afterwards and took it in a lower sense, (as they said,) he was wont to tell them, "He believed they would find other hardships put upon them as fasts and thanksgivings; and that in their practice they would be necessitated to come up to the highest sense: though they renounced it, at present, in their words. Particularly he wrote, hereupon, a very friendly letter to Dr. Marsh, who had been his tutor, wherein with all that strength which the argument could bear, or he was master of, but with the modesty of a pupil, he argued the point with him, of transferring allegiance to a king in possession. For the learned doctor was one of those who, upon the new settlement after the revolution, took the short oath of allegiance to the possessors, with such a declaration, or limitation, as should still leave him free to serve again the abdicated king, whose right he acknowledged, whenever his majesty should be in a condition to demand his allegiance, within any of these kingdoms. He had also a correspondence with several others upon that point, who were of the very same mind; some of whom he prevailed with to act a sincere part. And probably this might be one chief occasion of inducing him to write a Treatise of Christian Prudence, or Religious Wisdom not degenerating into Irreligious Craftiness, in Trying Times: as also a Treatise about the Oaths, with respect to those who take them in a Lower Sense; the last of which was never published.

Thus did this upright man, and sincere Christian, conduct himself in times of great difficulty and perplexity; he acted with uniform constancy, piety, and resignation, and as death approached, he regarded it as not so much the end of his existence, as the commencement of that period for which he had worked and suffered so long and so earnestly. His friend, Mr. Robert Nelson, was his constant companion during this his near approach to the dark valley. He never wished his pains away, nor the time of dissolution hastened; he

trusted in his merciful God, and was entirely resigned to whatever He should ordain.

On Thursday morning, the 11th of April, 1695, he apprehended himself to be departing, and said to Mr. Bell, the minister who attended him; I am now entering upon my last labour; the Lord gave and He is now taking away; and for that He is now taking away, blessed be the Name of the Lord. For I thank my God, I am going without any distrust, without the least misgiving to a place of rest, joy, and everlasting bliss. There is no life like a happy death; I have endeavoured even from my youth, to approve myself a faithful servant to my great Master, I have taken some pains in writing several books, I have seriously considered them, and am fully satisfied (looking on those about him) that you may find in them, the way to heaven; the Christian duties contained therein have been my practice as well as study, and now I find the advantage of it. Therefore be all of you careful to read them often, and seriously, and live suitably thereunto, that when you come to the condition I am now in, you may die with comfort as you see me do. I have some little pain indeed, but my pain is nothing so extraordinary as my hopes; for I have earnestly repented of all my sins, and verily believe that through the tender mercies of my God, and merits of my blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, I shall be carried up into Abraham's bosom. After which he made this short prayer: "I wait, O God, for that everlasting rest which I want at present, but shall not long; I am ready when Thou my God callest for me, yet can stay with patience till Thou pleaseest, for Thy time is the best time, and Thy pleasure the best pleasure."

After some of the prayers of the Church, and the commendatory one which he particularly desired, he gave a nephew of his, one John Davil, who was about fifteen years old, and of whose education he had taken



the charge and care, some advice in several particulars; as, 1. To observe all the commandments of God, for he that breaks one is guilty of the breach of all, for the wrath of God is revealed against all ungodliness, &c. 2. To despise and contemn the world, that is, let not the profits nor pleasures of it, allure or tempt you; nor let fear of danger affright you from any Christian duty, but have a perfect dependance upon God, for He is a kind, merciful, and a good God, I have found Him to be so. 3. To be humble, mild, and meek, to have candour and charity, &c. Then he exhorted him from all vice, as from pride, passion and dissimulation, hypocrisy, lying. Of which last he said, "do not tell a lie, no not to save a world, not to save your king, nor yourself." Next he gave his sister some directions of the like nature, how to teach and instruct her children. His brother coming in, he told him wherein he had given him offence, forgave him heartily and prayed for him and his; then he said, "Brother, have I done you any wrong, tell me, for if I have, I am ready and willing to make compensation," being answered, No, he put the same question to several others present, "for" said he, "I am now going to offer my gift upon the altar, therefore, if my brother has ought against me, I must first be reconciled to my brother and then offer my gift."

The afternoon before he died, says Mr. Nelson, he was pleased to acknowledge my friendship towards him; but said his wife had no reason to expect the same to her. I knew his concern for her, and gave him all the assurances of treating her as a relict of one whom I greatly esteemed, and dearly loved. Some little time after this he turned to me as I sat by his bedside, and, in a voice which I could hardly hear, said, "Mr. Nelson, it is brave to go to a place where one can enjoy a friend, without fear of losing him; where every thing is agreeable, because neither sin nor sorrow enter; where

there needs no sun to shine, forasmuch as God is the light of that place, and every saint is a star, each one's bliss is felt by every blessed inhabitant, and happiness is dispensed by a blessed circulation." He added something more about the New Jerusalem, and the heavenly state, which I lost by the lowness of his voice, and his difficulty in speaking. The same afternoon he desired his wife to read to him out of his Book of Death, which she did at two several times; at which he was extraordinarily devout, and very thankful to her, according to his usual custom, for her assistance. After this he called her to him, and said, "Child, trust God with thyself; I trust Him with thee freely. God's providence is the best protection; and there is no such way to engage His good providence, as by trusting Him." Some time the same afternoon she asked him how he did; he answered her, "Very praise-worthy well, I thank God, for one near departing." The prayers in the last agonies were read to him, at his desire, out of that book which was made the companion of his sickness, and which was the last effort of his charity for the salvation of his brethren. He sunk all of a sudden; for being raised to take some chocolate for his refreshment, he died in a moment in that posture.

Mr. Kettlewell was buried in the Church of All Hallows, Barking; the funeral service being performed by Bishop Ken.

As a parish priest, and one who was earnest for the salvation of souls; as a man of sound judgment, strict veracity, pure integrity, and unblemished honour, Mr. Kettlewell stands eminent in the annals of the Church of England. He lived in critical and perilous times, and he never flinched from his duty, or marred his usefulness by over zeal or intemperate assertion of his principles.—*Memoirs of Life, by Dr. Hickes.*

## KIDDER, RICHARD.

RICHARD KIDDER was born, according to Wood, in Sussex, and according to another account, in Suffolk; but the date of his birth is unknown. He went to Emmanuel College, in Cambridge, in 1649, and graduated in 1652, taking his M.A. degree in 1656. He was incorporated at Oxford two years afterwards. At this time he was a dissenter and republican, making his court to the existing authorities, from whom he obtained the living of Stanground, in Huntingdonshire. At the Restoration he had some scruples about conforming, which he soon, however, overcame, but not before he had vacated his living, to which of course he had no just claim. On his being admitted into the bosom of the Church, still retaining his lax and latitudinarian opinions, he was presented by Arthur, Earl of Essex, to the rectory of Raine, in 1664. Here he continued about ten years. In 1674, he was presented to the benefice of St. Martin Outwich, by the Merchant-Taylor's company. His next promotion took place in 1681, when he was appointed a prebend in the cathedral church of Norwich; which was succeeded by his nomination to the deanery of Peterborough, in the year 1689. About this time he took his D.D. degree by accumulation. Upon the deprivation of Dr. Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, for not taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to King William and Queen Mary, and Dr. Beveridge's refusal of that see, Dr. Kidder was nominated to succeed him. Notwithstanding his latitudinarian views, he at first had scruples about taking a bishopric not canonically vacant; but he soon overcame his scruples, and in 1691 he was consecrated. In the year 1693, he preached the lecture founded by the Hon.



Robert Boyle; and afterwards inserted his sermons on that occasion in his "Demonstration of the Messias," of which work they constitute the first, second, and third chapters in the second part of it. That performance is designed to prove the truth of the Christian religion, more particularly against the Jews, and was published in three volumes, 8vo; which made their appearance at different periods, one in 1684, another in 1699, and the third, in 1700.

He was killed in Bishop Ken's palace at Wells, together with his wife, by the falling of a stack of chimneys, during the storm which occurred in the night of November 26, 1703.

His largest work, excepting the article which we have already mentioned, is "A Commentary on the five Books of Moses; with a Dissertation concerning the Author, or Writer of the said Books, and a general Argument to each of them," published in 1694, in two volumes, 8vo. This work is the author's part of an intended commentary on the whole of Scripture, for the use of families, and of those well disposed persons who were desirous of reading them to the greatest advantage. A considerable number of the London clergy had divided the work amongst them; but the engagement of the greater part of them in the Popish controversy, and the death of others, prevented the completion of that useful design. To the first of these volumes is prefixed a learned dissertation, in which the bishop collects together and answers all the objections against Moses's being the author of the Pentateuch. Bishop Kidder was also the author of "The Life of Dr. Anthony Horneck," 1698, 8vo; "Critical Remarks upon some difficult Passages of Scripture, in a Letter to Sir Peter King," 1719, 8vo.; a posthumous publication; several practical treatises; tracts in the Popish controversy; the collection of Hebrew proverbs, added by way of appendix, to Mr. Ray's collection of proverbs; and numerous ser-

mons, &c., the subjects and dates of which are particularised in the *Biographia Britannica*.—*Biog. Brit.* *Birch's Tillotson.* *Bowles's Ken.*

## KING, HENRY.

HENRY KING, son of John King, (see succeeding article) was born at Wornall, in the month of January 1591; educated partly at Thame, in Oxfordshire, and partly at Westminster; and elected student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1608. After taking his degrees and entering into orders, he became chaplain to King James the First, afterwards Archdeacon of Colchester, then residentiary of St. Paul's, and canon of Christ Church; doctor of divinity, in 1625; afterwards chaplain to Charles I.; dean of Rochester, in 1638; and Bishop of Chichester, in 1641. Though he was always esteemed puritanically affected, and had been promoted to Chichester, in order to please the Puritans; yet, upon the breaking out of the civil wars, and the dissolution of episcopacy, he was treated by them with great severity. At the Restoration, he recovered his bishopric; and Wood tells us, that "he was esteemed, by many persons of his diocese and neighbourhood, the epitome of all honours, virtues, and generous nobleness, and a person never to be forgotten by his tenants and the poor." He died October 1st, 1669, after having published several works; which consist of:—1. Sermons; printed at different times. 2. Exposition of the Lord's Prayer; 1628, 4to. 3. The Psalms of David, from the new translation of the Bible, turned into metre, &c.; 1651, 12mo. 4. A Deep Groan fetched at the funeral of the incomparable and glorious monarch, King Charles I.; 1649, in one sheet. 5. Poems, elegies, paradoxes, sonnets; 1657, 8vo. 6. Divers Latin and Greek poems; published in several books. 7. There is a Letter of his

to Mr. Izaak Walton, concerning the three imperfect books of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, dated at Chichester, November 17th, 1664, and prefixed to Walton's Life of Hooker.—*Gen. Dict.*

## KING, JOHN.

JOHN KING was born at Wornall, about the year 1559, educated at Westminster School, and sent to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1576; where he took, in due time, his degrees in arts. He was afterwards made chaplain to Queen Elizabeth; Archdeacon of Nottingham, in 1590; doctor of divinity, in 1601; dean of Christ Church, in 1605; and Bishop of London, in 1611. Besides his "Lectures upon Jonah," printed in 1594, he published several sermons. King James I. used to style him "the king of preachers;" and Lord Chief Justice Coke often declared, that "he was the best speaker in the star-chamber in his time." He was so constant in preaching, after he was a bishop, that he never missed a Sunday, when his health permitted. He died on the 30th of March, 1621; and soon after, the Papists reported, that he died a member of their Church; but the falsity of this story was sufficiently exposed by his son Henry, in a sermon at St. Paul's Cross soon after; and by Bishop Godwin, in his appendix to his "Commentarius de Præsulibus Angliæ."—*Gen. Dict.*

## KING, JOHN GLEN.

JOHN GLEN KING was born in Norfolk, in 1731. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, where he took his master's decree in 1763, where he afterwards took his D.D. degree. In 1764, he became chaplain to the British factory, at St. Petersburg, where the empress



Catharine appointed him her medallist. Soon after his return from Russia, he purchased the Chapel in Broad Court, Drury-lane, where he officiated till his death, in 1787. He published: the Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, 4to.; and Observations on the Barberini Vase in the *Archæologia*.—*Gent. Mag.*

## KING, WILLIAM.

WILLIAM KING was born at Antrim, in Ireland, on the first of May, 1650. At twelve years of age, he was sent to the grammar school, at Dungannon, in the county of Tyrone; and, at seventeen, to Trinity College, near Dublin, where he took his degree of B.A., in 1670; and of M.A., in 1673. In 1674, he was admitted into priest's orders by Dr. Parker, Archbishop of Tuam, who, taking him for his chaplain, in 1676, presented him the same year to a prebend, and afterwards to the precentorship, of Tuam. In 1679, he was promoted by his patron, then Archbishop of Dublin, to the chancellorship of St. Patrick, and to the parish of St. Warburgh, in Dublin. He had the reputation of uncommon abilities and learning; and a season was now approaching, which gave him a fair opportunity of displaying them.

In the reign of James II., he came forward to vindicate manfully the Protestant cause in the truly Catholic Church of Ireland. One name only is on record, or at least two, as having been found faithless in that hour of trial, to the Church of Ireland. Peter Manby, dean of Derry, had solicited and expected a bishopric, and being disappointed, he apostatized to Popery, in 1686. In 1687, Manby, having published a pamphlet in vindication of his conduct, entitled, *Considerations* which obliged him to embrace the Catholic Religion; King drew up An Answer, and printed it at Dublin the

same year, in 4to. Manby, encouraged by the court, and assisted by the most learned champions of the Church of Rome, published a reply under this title, *A Reformed Catechism, &c.*; and our author soon after rejoined, in *A Vindication of the Answer to the Considerations*, 1688, 4to. Manby dropped the controversy, but dispersed a sheet of paper, artfully written, with this title, *A Letter to a Friend*, shewing the vanity of this opinion, that every man's sense and reason are to guide him in Matters of Faith; but Mr. King did not suffer this to pass without confuting it, which he did in a *Vindication of the Christian Religion and Reformation*, against the attempts of a late letter, &c., 1688, 4to.

The persecution to which the Protestants in Ireland, and especially the clergy, were exposed under the tyrant James II. is a matter of history. Many fled, and those who remained stood in peril of their lives. Even in the city of Dublin, under the eye of the government, hardly one escaped affronts and abuses, or could walk the streets in security and quiet, or safely perform his public ministrations. To enumerate all the acts of violence which they endured were impossible. But Dr. King has mentioned the names of sixteen or seventeen clergymen, and specified the outrages which were offered to them by assault, by imprisonment, by menaces, by imprecations; by the musket and the lighted match, by the naked sword, and by the bludgeon; in the street and in the highway, in the church and in the church-yard, in the reading-desk and in the pulpit; whilst conducting the devotions, or ministering to the instruction of the living, or whilst performing the last solemn offices over the dead. Their visitations of the sick and dying were impeded or interrupted by the Popish priests; who with insults and threats pretended to be acting by the king's authority, and claimed the faithful

Protestant and member of the Church as a convert to the Romish corruptions.

The conduct of Dr. King himself at this trying crisis is worthy of grateful recollection. The Archbishop of Dublin, when compelled to fly for his personal safety, substituted Dr. King as his commissary, to visit and take care of his diocese during his absence. But a doubt having arisen about the legal execution of the commission, Dr. King declined the office; and prevailed upon the two chapters of Christ Church and St. Patrick's, of the latter of which he had been elected dean, to choose the Bishop of Meath as administrator of the spiritualities, in the absence of the archbishop. He himself, nevertheless, took an active and zealous part in assisting the bishop to meet the spiritual necessities and promote the comfort and benefit of those distressed members of the Church who were precluded by poverty from fleeing into England; or who, having secured some small remnant of their property from plunder, continued to reside at home with the hope of preserving it. And thus, by the zealous co-operation of these good men, the churches of the diocese were regulated and the deserted parishes supplied with well-qualified curates, so that scarce a congregation was destitute of a pastor.

In 1688, he was elected by the chapter of St. Patrick's in Dublin, their dean, and he concurred fully in the Revolution, thinking that the tyranny of James fully justified that proceeding. He preached before William who after the battle of Boyne entered Dublin in triumph and returned thanks at St. Patrick's Cathedral, where a splendid *Te Deum* was performed. On the 25th of January, in 1691, he was consecrated Bishop of Derry and in the same year he published at London, in 4to. "The State of the Protestants in Ireland, under the late King James's government; in which their carriage towards him is justified, and the absolute necessit



of their endeavouring to be freed from his government, and of submitting to their present majesties, is demonstrated." The third edition, with additions, was printed at London, the year after, in 8vo. It was eulogized by Bishop Burnet, and attacked by Charles Lesley. Immediately after his consecration he proceeded to visit his diocese. Its condition was one of great distress and misery; and such as to require his immediate care, attended by powerful remedies. In consequence of the ravages, to which it had been long subject, its villages and plantations were all destroyed; its churches burnt or dilapidated; its clergy withdrawn, and its parishes forsaken; the poverty of the people, and the want of tillage and cattle, being insufficient for the support of a resident ministry. To the correction of these evils the diocesan applied himself with vigour and effect. Partly by his own contributions, and partly by an arrear of rent collected from the tenants of the bishopric during the vacancy of the see, and ordered by the government to be placed at his disposal,—he repaired the churches which had been laid waste by King James's army, and built several new ones in addition. He collected about him an efficient clergy, by compelling the incumbents either to reside or to appoint and maintain sufficient curates; and many he supported from his own revenues, until the improvements of their respective parishes provided them with a decent maintenance. And, as vacancies occurred amongst his clergy, he filled them with men remarkable for their learning and moderation, as well as exemplary for their piety and good morals. This, however, was not effected without delay, nor, indeed, without considerable dissatisfaction and opposition. In his MS. correspondence, he says of himself, "I believe no bishop was ever more railed at for the first two years, than I was at Londonderry, by both clergy and laity. But by good offices, steadiness in my duty, and just management, I got the better of them, and they joined

with me heartily in promoting those very things for which they opposed and condemned me at first."

From without, also, the situation of his diocese brought him into conflict with other difficulties, which he combated with earnest zeal, regulated and directed by knowledge. New colonies from Scotland had poured into the northern parts of Ireland, and thus, unhappily, had strength been added to the previous armament of dissent and separation, arranged against the Church. To counteract this evil the Bishop of Derry directed his efforts: he laboured fervently, but temperately and prudently withal, by the methods of gentle and Christian reasoning, and by an example of meekness, charity, and good offices, to work upon the Protestant dissenters in his diocese, and to persuade them to a conformity with the discipline and ceremonies, as well as to a profession of the doctrines and creeds of the Church. The work of his ministry is recorded to have been attended with considerable success. And a proof and a specimen of his episcopal vigilance remains in his treatise on *The Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*: a treatise in which the arguments in vindication of the Church's forms of divine worship are exemplified from Holy Scripture, set forth in a perspicuous method, and enforced by conclusive reasoning; which is calm and affectionate in manner, free from all bitterness of spirit, and all harshness of language; and of which, whilst some opponents have commended "the air of seriousness and gravity, becoming the weight of the subject, as well as the dignity of the writer's character," no one has been found to confute its positions, or to invalidate its truth.

This discourse of the Bishop of Derry, however, called forth an answer from a Mr. Boyse, a person of some eminence amongst the dissenting ministers of the day, composed in a manner, and with a spirit, very different from the author's, who, however, considered himself

required to give some explanation concerning certain matters of fact, which were attributed to him as mistakes, but which he deemed capable of proof. In this undertaking he was led to mention several particulars of the state of religion, as professed by churchmen and Protestant dissenters; and these particulars it is now intended to abstract from the tract, and submit them to the reader as matters of historical information. The tract was entitled, "An Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocese of Derry, concerning a Book lately published by Mr. J. Boyse," and so it was published in Dublin, 1694. It was also published in London, 1706, under the title of "An Admonition to the Dissenters, being a Vindication of a Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God."

After some introductory remarks, he begins with stating that, at the time of writing, he had been above three years amongst the inhabitants of Derry, and had taken the best care he could to inform himself of the state and condition of the diocese, and of every parish therein. He had visited each of them several times, and discoursed personally with many hundreds, and informed himself particularly of the customs, manners, inclinations, and scruples of every sort and persuasion. He had found, to his great trouble, much ignorance among the poor people; insomuch that of 800, or more, of the dissenters' communion, with whom he personally discoursed, he did not find above four persons that could give any account of their catechism, and only two that could repeat it, and a great many that could neither say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, nor Ten Commandments. Of this he had many witnesses, that were present at some of his discourses.

"I do not say," continues the bishop, "this ignorance was peculiar to dissenters, for too many conformable persons were in the same condition. This I looked on



with great compassion and concern, as it became me and, in order to remedy it, I took care to have English schools kept in every parish, according to law; and obliged the schoolmaster to teach the Catechism, and the ministers to catechise in each parish: and I furnished them with Catechisms, which, with God's assistance, has proved of good use to such as are conformable. Near 2000 of all ages having since learned the Catechism, and presented themselves to be confirmed. It could not have the same influence on you that differed from me; and yet I hope my endeavours have not been useless to you, but have helped to raise an emulation in you to instruct your children."

The great obstacle to the dissenters learning their Catechism, the bishop found to be its length and intricacy, insomuch that, generally speaking, whoever could not read must despair of getting it by heart. He was thus put upon persuading them to make use of an easier Catechism, not excluding their own, if they had a mind to it.

At this time there were only nine meeting-houses in the diocese, "and I think," he observes, "the number is not increased." He then reports the result of the best inquiry he could make among themselves and other people, according to which, upon an average of one meeting-house and one Lord's-day with another, there were not 300 at each meeting: so that, supposing 30,000 persons as computed to be the amount of those persons who professed themselves to be of the Presbyterian persuasion, and who, on that account, absented themselves from church, there appeared to be only one in ten, or there-about, who attended God's worship anywhere on the Lord's-day. The case seems to have been not much better before the late troubles: for though there were then some more meeting-houses, the number of people attached to them was proportionably more also.

The bishop found the sense of religion much decayed amongst them by means of this small number of their meeting-houses; and many of them, when pressed by him to worship God somewhere, answered, that they could do it at home. "And, indeed," he adds, "I have found some that had not been at any public worship in seven years; and it is not to be wondered at, when some of you are ten miles, some twenty, from a meeting-place. I cast about in my mind how to remedy this; and in order to it, inquired of many of you why you did not frequent the public church, since you had none else which you could constantly attend with your families. I perceived that these objections especially had stuck with you formerly: first, that our ministers were Popishly inclined; secondly, that some of them were of ill-lives and negligent; and thirdly, that our service was only human inventions, and had no particular warrant from Scripture. The first and second of these I found, by God's blessing, in great measure removed at my coming amongst you; so that I cannot say that any of you ever objected them to me. And as to the third, I particularly examined what things they were in our ordinary Lord's-day's service which you taxed as human inventions, for I only invited you to that service, and which made you think it more justifiable to stay at home than to come to our churches; and I carefully marked what you objected, and put them in the form that you now find them in this book."

The bishop elsewhere observes, that the meeting-houses were more numerous in his diocese of Derry than in the neighbouring dioceses of the north; there being, that he could learn, only four in Raphoe diocese, in which, and in the other dioceses of the north, the popish churches were proportionally as many more than the meetings as they were in the diocese of Derry. In this diocese it has been already stated that the number of meeting-houses was nine: in the same diocese there

were at the time forty-two congregations, in which the offices of the Church were constantly performed.

In another part of the tract is introduced a curious computation as to the ministering of the Lord's Supper. In the preceding seven years, the Lord's Supper had been celebrated amongst the Presbyterians—

In Londonderry, twice . . .	2
In Clondermot, once . . .	1
At Ballindret, once . . .	1
At Ballykelly, once . . .	1
At Burt, twice . . .	2
At Ardstra, once . . .	1
At Ahadowy, once . . .	1
<hr/>	
In all, nine times . . .	9

So that, in the whole diocese, it had been celebrated by them only nine times in seven years; and that, at one with another, there were about 400 who received, though the bishop's information did not allow so many. In seven years about 3,600 may be computed to have received.

But in the Church, since he came to the diocese, which was about three years and two months before the date of his treatise, the Lord's Supper had been administered—

In the cathedral about . . .	43 times
In the parish churches, first year	78 „
„ „ second year	103 „
„ „ third year	162 „
<hr/>	
In all . . . . .	386 „

So that in the Church the Holy Sacrament had been administered in the diocese, during three years and



two months, about 386 times, being about forty-three for once in the Presbyterian meetings during seven years.

“As to the number of communicants in the Church,” adds the bishop, “I cannot give an exact computation; but as to the cathedral, where I have, for the most part, officiated myself, I can give this account:

At 4 Easter Sacraments, one with another, above 200; in all . . . . .	800
At 3 Christmas Sacraments, and 3 Whit- Sundays, one with another, above 100 at a time . . . . .	600
At 33 monthly Sacraments, one with another, 50 . . . . .	1650
In all . . . . .	<hr/> 3050

“From which it is manifest, that near as many have received, in one parish in this diocese, in about three years’ time, as with you, in the whole diocese, in twice that time; notwithstanding the numerousness of those who are of your profession.

“As to the larger towns, I call only three such in this part of the country, that is, Londonderry and Strabane, in this diocese, and Coleraine, on the border of it. Now, as to Londonderry, it has had this Sacrament administered but twice in six or seven years, and Coleraine but once in that time; and as to Strabane, though it, as well as the others, had a settled ministry in it before and some time since the troubles, yet I am informed, from good hands, that in twenty-six years last past the Lord’s Supper has been administered in it but twice. And I have the more reason to believe this, because your Sacraments are administered with so great a concourse of spectators and hearers, besides those that receive, that they can hardly escape obser-

vation, which would have been reckoned a profanation of this Holy Mystery in the primitive times, and in earnest an abuse brought in by Popery."

The foregoing extracts bring us acquainted with some circumstances in the religious profession of the north of Ireland, as maintained by Churchmen and Presbyterians; of the condition of the Papists it did not fall within the scope of Bishop King's undertaking to make any mention.

Alive, however, to the evils and dangers which continually beset the Church from her enemies on either side, and prepared to meet and repel their efforts with "the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left," the new prelate, who had been impressed by painful experience, as well as by profound theological learning and historical knowledge, with a due sense of the character of the Romish Church, was prepared to protect his flock against assaults from that quarter. And, in counteracting the progress of Popery in his diocese, much credit has been given, with reason, to Bishop King for his exertions.

Many of the Irish natives having left their habitations in the barony of Inishowen, in the county of Donegal, and followed the Irish army into the south, after the raising of the siege of Londonderry, several families, having migrated from the highlands of Scotland, settled in their places. These highlanders being Protestants, but not understanding the English language, presented a petition to the Bishop of Derry, praying that a minister might be sent to perform divine offices amongst them in their own tongue. This was readily granted, and two ministers were accordingly commissioned to celebrate divine service in that barony in the Irish language; one of them being a beneficed clergyman, and the other receiving a competent allowance from the bishop. And by the blessing of God upon their

labours, they formed a congregation of four or five hundred persons, none of whom understood English.

In the year 1702, Bishop King published at Dublin his celebrated and very valuable work, entitled "De Origine Mali, &c.," 4to., which was re-printed the same year at London, in 8vo. The object of this work is to shew how all the several kinds of evil with which the world abounds are consistent with the goodness of God, and may be accounted for without the supposition of an evil principle. It was attacked by Bayle. In the same year he was translated to the Archbishopric of Dublin; and in 1709, he published a sermon preached before the house of peers, entitled, "Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge consistent with the Freedom of Man's Will," in which he advanced a doctrine concerning the moral attributes of God, as being different from the moral qualities of the same name in man. This valuable and most important work has been re-printed within the last few years, and is worthy of the deep thought which the perusal of it excites.

Archbishop King, on his translation, found the Protestants greatly multiplied since the Revolution and many new churches wanting in several parts of his diocese for the conveniency of the people to attend Divine worship. He immediately applied himself with extraordinary assiduity to this pious work; and by application of the impropriated forfeited tithes, pursuant to an act passed in England the eleventh year of William III., by large benefactions collected by his discreet solicitations from well-disposed gentlemen, and by his own generous contribution, he procured fourteen churches to be repaired, seven to be re-built, and nineteen to be erected in places where no Divine service had been performed since the Reformation. To supply these new churches with pastors, as the contiguous benefices, which often consisted of many united parishes, became vacant, he divided them and settled a resident clergyman in



each. Most of these parishes being not endowed with glebe-land for the comfortable support of the incumbents, he took advantage of the statute, recently passed in the second year of Queen Anne, and apportioned to each out of the see-land a glebe of twenty acres, at a moderate reserved rent; and in the parishes where the see had not any estate, he either purchased himself, or procured from the trustees of the first-fruits, when that act of royal bounty had been conferred upon the Church, an allowance to purchase glebes, either in fee or at a small reserved rent; so that most of the vicarages of his diocese were supplied with convenient land.

Meanwhile the many divisions that he had made of unions, which formerly had produced a very considerable emolument to the incumbents of the united parishes, reduced the income of the clergy of the separate parishes, so as scarcely to suffice for their decent maintenance. To remedy this in some measure, as the prebends of St. Patrick's became vacant he annexed them to the vicarages, which were before separate, and in distinct persons. He purchased a large parcel of inappropriate tithes, and vested them in trustees for the augmentation of small cures in his diocese, on the condition of the incumbent's constant residence. And as the leases of some appropriated tithes, scattered in different small parishes of his diocese, expired, he executed new leases to the vicars, many of whom thereby doubled the income of their benefices; the archbishop, at the same time, providing for the indemnity of his successors, by purchasing an equivalent in lands near Dublin, and annexing them to the see.

In the year 1717, Archbishop King was appointed one of the lords-justices of Ireland; and he held the same office in the years 1721 and 1723. He died at his palace of St. Sepulchre's, in Dublin, May 8th, 1729, when he wanted but a week of completing his seventy-ninth year.—*Mant's Ireland. Biog. Brit. Swift. Burnet.*

## KINGSMILL, ANDREW.

ANDREW KINGSMILL was born at Sidmanton, in Hampshire, in 1538, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; but removed from thence to a fellowship of All-Souls. He became an admired preacher; but on turning Puritan, went to Lausanne, in Switzerland, where he died in 1569. His works are:—1. A View of Man's Estate, 1574, 8vo. 2. A Godly Advice touching Marriage, 8vo, 1580. 3. Treatise for such as are troubled in Mind, or afflicted in Body, 8vo. 4. Godly Exhortation to bear patiently all Afflictions for the Gospel. 5. Conference between a learned Christian and an afflicted Conscience, 8vo.—*Wood*.

## KIPPIS, ANDREW.

ANDREW KIPPIS was born at Nottingham, March 28, 1725. He was educated under Dr. Doddridge, at Northampton; and in 1746, became minister of an independent congregation at Boston, in Lincolnshire, from whence he removed, in 1750, to Dorking, in Surrey; and in 1753, to the meeting in Prince's Street, Westminster. In 1763, he was chosen one of the tutors of Coward's Academy; and in 1767, the university of Edinburgh conferred on him the degree of doctor in divinity. In 1778, he was chosen a member of the Society of Antiquaries; and in 1779, a fellow of the Royal Society. Dr. Kippis was one of the tutors of the New Academy or College, as it was called, at Hackney, in 1786; but in a few years he resigned that situation, and died, October 8, 1795. He undertook a new edition of the "Biographia Britannica," of which five volumes were printed; but in such a manner as to give no hopes

of its termination. He also projected the "New Annual Register;" and published a number of pieces, the principal of which were, the "Life of Captain Cook;" "A Vindication of the Dissenters;" a volume of Sermons; and "Observations on the late Contests in the Royal Society."

Commencing life as a Calvinist, he took the Bible and the Bible only for his guide, and examined thereby the principles of Calvin, which he determined to renounce. He ceased to be a worshipper of the Lord Jesus Christ, and died a Socinian, or, as he chose to call himself, a Unitarian.—*Rees's Funeral Sermon.*

#### KNIGHTON, HENRY DE.

HENRY DE KNIGHTON, was one of the canons of Leicester, at the close of the fourteenth century, under Richard II. He wrote a History of English Affairs in five books, which may be said to begin at the Conquest, since he has only a short Abstract of Saxon Affairs in his first book. It is continued down to 1395. He fairly owns that he transcribes from Ralph Higden, whom he imitates also in the crotchet of making the first fifteen chapters of his second book give his name in initial letters, thus—HENRICUS CNITTON.—*Nicholson's Historical Library.*

#### KNATT, EDWARD.

EDWARD KNATT, a Jesuit, whose real name was Matthias Wilson, and who sometimes called himself Nicholson Smith, is chiefly known for his controversy with Chillingworth, to whose life, therefore, the reader is referred. He was born at Pegsworth, near Morpeth, in Northumberland, in the year 1580. He was entered



among the Jesuits at the age of twenty-six, being already in priest's orders; and is represented in the "Bibliotheca patrum societatis Jesu," as a man of low estate, but of very great abilities: *vir magnis animi dotibus humili in corpore præditus*. He taught divinity a long time in the English college, at Rome. He was afterwards appointed sub-provincial of the province of England; and, after he had exercised that employment out of the kingdom, he was sent thither to perform the functions of provincial. He was twice so employed. He was present, as provincial, at the general assembly of the orders of the Jesuits, held at Rome, in the year 1646, and was elected one of the definitors. He died at London, on the 4th of January, 1655-6, and was buried the next day, in the Church of St. Pancras, near that city.—*De Maizeaux's Life of Chillingworth*.

## KNOX, JOHN.

JOHN KNOX was born at Gifford, in the county of East Lothian, Scotland, in the year 1505. He was educated first at Haddington, and then at the University of St. Andrews, under John Major. From the study of the schoolmen, he proceeded to the works of St. Jerome and St. Augustine. Men's minds were at that time in a very unsettled state; the corruptions in the Established Church in Scotland were very great. Half the wealth of the nation belonging to the clergy, the clergy were secularized, and by the magnificence of their establishments, in the higher ranks of ecclesiastics, excited the cupidity and envy of the nobility. Simony prevailed to a fearful extent. The supremacy of the pope, and the worst of those errors which now distinguish Romanism from Catholicism prevailed. For two centuries the demand for Church reform had been made by the more devoted Church-

men. It was delayed too long, and at the period we are speaking of, when Knox was now a young man, the proceedings of Luther in Germany were rousing the energies of the youthful mind of Europe. The Protestant feeling had made considerable progress in Scotland before Knox declared himself a reformer, and it was not till 1542, that he declared against Romanism. He had been ordained in the Church, but on his taking Protestant views, he relinquished thoughts of officiating, and became tutor in the family of Hugh Douglas, of Langniddric. Here he seems to have established a kind of conventicle, where he read the Scriptures and catechised children,—in other words, he indirectly preached. And he was prosecuted. That he attracted notice is clear, because he had thoughts of retreating to Germany, But he soon pursued another course.

Cardinal Beaton, who was at the head of the Scottish Church, had been cruelly murdered. With these murderers Mr. Knox sympathized, and he spoke of the murder as laudable. His panegyrist, Dr. M'Crie, observes, "I think no one who carefully reads what he has written on this subject, can doubt that he justified the action of the conspirators. The truth is, he held the opinion, that persons who, according to the law of God, and the just laws of society, had forfeited their lives, by the commission of flagrant crimes, such as notorious murderers and tyrants, might warrantably be put to death by private individuals; provided all redress, in the ordinary course of justice, was rendered impossible, in consequence of the offenders having usurped the executive authority, or being systematically protected by oppressive rulers."

It is with sorrow that such sentiments from so respectable a Presbyterian as Dr. M'Crie, must be read.

"It is very horrid," says Hume, "but at the same time somewhat amusing, to consider the joy, alacrity, and pleasure, which that historian (John Knox) discovers

in his narrative of Beaton's assassination," and even his panegyrist admits that "the pleasantry Knox has mingled with the narrative of Beaton's death and burial is unseasonable and unbecoming," though he apologises for it from the natural jocularity of Knox's mind.

It is necessary to observe this when we form an estimate of Knox's character. The assassins of Beaton having possession of the Castle of St. Andrews, many persons professing an attachment to Protestantism, although one would hope they were rather political than religious Protestants, flocked to them, and among others, John Knox, who received from them a call to preach, which he seems to have regarded as a more valid call than his ordination. From this time he seems to have held the convenient doctrine that he, and only those who thought with him, knew the gospel, that every one opposed to him was therefore opposed to God, and that he, as God's servant, might resort to any means in his power to silence them.

He remained at St. Andrews until the castle was taken by the French, when he was carried to France and remained a prisoner on board the galleys, until the latter end of 1549. Although at that time, his sanguine temperament induced him to look forward to better days, and the hopes he expressed were afterwards regarded as predictions by his admirers, he seems for the most part, to have been in a desponding and unhappy state of mind.

When released from prison, in 1549, he passed over to England and became a preacher, first at Berwick, and then at Newcastle. In 1552, he was appointed chaplain to young King Edward, and by the royal youth was recommended to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Cranmer, who offered him the living of All Hallows, in London, but he refused to accept it from his dislike of the Liturgy. It is said that young Edward offered him a bishopric, but that Knox fell into a passion on receiving the offer, and rejected it as savouring of anti-



christ. He was generally consistent with his principles, and naturally abhorred a Catholic Ritual and a Catholic Hierarchy, such as the Church of England possesses. But he still continued to preach, and in the words of Dr. M'Crie, "regarding the worship of the Popish Church as grossly idolatrous, and its doctrine as damnable, he attacked them both with much fervour." At this time he formed the acquaintance of Marjory Bowes, who afterwards became his first wife.

When Queen Mary ascended the throne, he quitted England, for his doctrine appeared as damnable to her, as her doctrine did to him. According to his own words he "was not ripe or able to glorify God by his death." He escaped to Dieppe, in France, and went from thence to Geneva, in the year 1554. When he had escaped the danger, he began to regret that he had not remained to encounter it, and on reviewing his life, he says, "I was assaulted, yea infected, with more gross sins, that is, my wicked nature desired the favours, the estimation, and praise of men; against which, albeit that sometimes the Spirit of God did move me to fight, and earnestly did stir me (God knoweth I lie not) to sob and lament for these imperfections, yet never ceased they to trouble me, when any occasion was offered; and so privily and craftily did they enter into my breast, that I could not perceive myself to be wounded, till vain glory had almost got the upperhand. O Lord! be merciful to my great offence; and deal not with me according to my great iniquity, but according to the multitude of Thy mercies."

At Geneva, he found in John Calvin a kindred spirit, and was admitted to his friendship. His mind was at this time violently excited by the cruel persecutions of the Romanizing party in the Church of England; but he unfortunately has provided the Romanists with a palliation of their conduct, by exhibiting in himself a temper which has made them conclude that he would have been a Bonner if he could. The modern panegyrist

of Mr. Knox asks, "what terms can be too strong for stigmatizing the execrable system of persecution projected by the dissembling vindictive Gardiner, the brutal barbarity of the bloody Bonner, or the unrelenting insatiable cruelty of Mary." Terms of reprobation against the Marian persecution cannot be too strong, but it is not by returning railing for railing that Christians are to meet their opponents. Besides Gardiner and Bonner only acted on Knox's own principles. A standing text with him, and indeed with all the immediate disciples of Calvin, was that injunction mentioned in the 13th of Deuteronomy against participating in the idolatry of the Gentile nation. "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly," &c. &c., "thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him, neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare him, neither shalt thou conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death. Thou shalt stone him with stones that he die," &c. "Such, therefore," concludes John Knox, "as solicit only to idolatry (Popery,) *ought to be punished with death, without favour or respect of persons.* The punishment of such crimes as are idolatry, blasphemy, and others, that touch the majesty of God, doth not pertain to kings or chief rulers only, *but to the whole body of the people;* and to *every member* of the same, according to the vocation of every man, and according to that possibility and occasion which God doth minister to revenge the injury done against His glory."—"To the same law, I say, and covenant, are the Gentiles no less bound than were the Jews; whensoever God doth *illuminate the eyes of any multitude* or people, and *putteth the sword in their own hand* to remove such enormities from amongst them as before God they know to be abominable."

The following was the kind of language he used with

reference to the Queen of England. “First,—If Mary and her counsellors had been dead before these days, then should not her iniquity and cruelty so manifestly have appeared to the world. Secondly,—Jezabel never erected half so many gallows in all Israel, as mischievous Mary hath done in London alone. Thirdly,—Would any of you have confessed two years ago, that Mary your mirror had been false, dissembling, unconstant, proud, and a breaker of promises, except such promises as she has made to your God the pope, to the great shame and dishonour of her noble father. Fourthly,—The love of her native country could not move that wicked woman’s heart to pity. Fifthly,—She declared herself an open traitress to the realm of England, contrary to the just laws of the same, to bring in a stranger, and to make a proud stranger king, to the destruction of the nobility, and subversion of the realm. Sixthly,—If God for our scourge, suffered her and her cruel council to come to authority. Seventhly,—Under an English name she hath a Spaniard’s heart. Eighthly,—Much trouble in England for establishing that unhappy and wicked woman’s authority, I mean of her that now reigneth in God’s wrath.”

And after having railed against the queen, the ministry, and the bishops in the coarsest manner, he subjoins a prayer, where he points directly to them. This prayer he recommends to the English; where by misapplying the text, and teaching the subjects to curse the higher powers, he uses the Bible as ill as he had used the government before. We shall present the reader with some of the expressions:—“Repress the pride of those blood-thirsty tyrants, consume them in Thy wrath, pour forth Thy vengeance upon them. O let the vengeance of Thy servants’ blood that is shed, be openly shewed upon them in our sight. Delay not Thy vengeance O Lord, but let death devour them in haste, and let the earth swallow them, and let them go down quick to the hells, for there



is no hope of their amendment; the fear and reverence of Thy Holy Name is quite banished from their hearts: and therefore yet again, O Lord, consume them, consume them in Thine anger, and let them never bring their wicked councils to effect, but according to the godly powers let them be taken in the snare which they have prepared for Thine elect."

These are the effects of blind and intemperate zeal. Thus Knox wrests the Scriptures to mislead subjects from their duty, and turns his prayer into sin. We are charged in the Scripture to honour the king, and not to curse him so much as in thought. And the higher powers, though then heathen, are called ministers of God. We are commanded to lay aside all evil speaking, to love our enemies, and pray for them, to bless and not to curse them. Notwithstanding all this, and a great deal more to the same purpose, Knox makes no scruple to speak evil of dignities, and prescribes a prayer for the English to treat their governors, in much harsher language, than St. Michael thought fit to use against the devil.

While Knox was at Geneva, he was invited by the English refugees who had established themselves at Frankfort on the Maine, to officiate as their minister, and reluctantly on the advice of Calvin he accepted the invitation. But John Knox could only tolerate Knoxians, and he laid at Frankfort the foundation of English dissent.

The congregation at Frankfort, in spite of remonstrances from the English refugees at Zurich and Strasburg, had determined to omit the use of the surplice, the litany, the audible responses, and the other ceremonies of the Church of England, both because some of them would seem strange to the Protestants among whom they were residing, and others were superstitious and superfluous. They spoke of the petition, "By Thy Holy Incarnation," &c., as a conjuring of God. They

caviled at the angelic hymn, "Glory to God in the highest," because the Papists use it. Knox came only to prejudice their minds yet more against the Prayer Book. He told them plainly that he could not dispense the Sacraments agreeably to the English Liturgy; and if he could not be allowed to perform the service in a manner more consonant to Scripture, he requested that some other person might be employed in this part of the duty, and he would confine himself to preaching.

With some members of the congregation, he drew up in Latin, a summary of the Book of Common Prayer, and submitted it to Calvin. By Calvin's superior genius he was overawed, and to no other authority would he submit. Calvin replied in a letter, dated January 20th, 1555: "He lamented the unseemly contentions which prevailed among them; he said, that although he had always recommended moderation respecting external ceremonies, yet he could not but condemn the obstinacy of those who would consent to no change of old customs; that in the Liturgy of England he had found many *tolerable fooleries*, (*tolerabiles ineptias*,) practices which might be tolerated at the beginning of a Reformation, but which ought afterwards to be removed; he thought that the present condition of the English exiles warranted them to attempt this, and to agree upon an order more conducive to edification; and, for his part, he could not understand what those persons meant who discovered such fondness for Popish dregs."

This testimony of Calvin to our Liturgy ought never to be forgotten;—and Knox, and his followers, proceeded to form a Liturgy which was based on our Prayer Book, and other forms of prayer. In 1555, Dr. Cox, who had been preceptor to Edward VI., arrived at Frankfort, and through his influence the English service was again restored in its integrity. Knox was not a person to be easily silenced. He contended that nothing which was destitute of a Divine warrant ought

to be intruded upon any Christian Church. He declared that he could prove, publicly, that in the Prayer Book, for which some entertained such an overweening fondness, there were things imperfect, impure, and superstitious; and censured the reforming party in the Church of England for not having carried the Reformation further when they had the power.

It was soon seen that the rebellious spirit of Knox would submit to authority neither ecclesiastical nor civil, and to get rid of him they pointed out to the magistrates the treasonable principles which he had broached in some of his meetings, especially his speaking of the emperor, as "no less an enemy of Christ than Nero." It was mean-spirited in the English thus to obtain his dismissal by a side wind, but he would probably, if he had remained there, have involved them in serious trouble with the government. Strype says, that they were obliged to act as they did for their security. The end was, that Knox was advised to retire. And peace being restored to the English congregation, they boasted that they had now the face of an English Church. Upon which, the modern biographer of Knox, Dr. M'Crie, exclaims, "Yes! they could now raise their heads above all the reformed Churches who had the honour of entertaining them; who, though they might have all the office-bearers and ordinances instituted by Christ, had neither bishop, nor litany, nor surplice! They could now lift up their faces in the presence of the Church of Rome herself, and cherish the hope that she would not altogether disown them. But let me not forget, that the men of whom I write were at this time suffering exile for the Protestant religion, and that they really detested the body of Popery, though childishly and superstitiously attached to its attire, and gestures, and language."

It is agreeable to churchmen to see the same terms of censure applied to their predecessors as to themselves.



After Knox had left Scotland, some of the leading prelates of the established Church endeavoured to reform the existing abuses, and several provincial councils were held, but there was no great man who, by self-discipline, as well as by learning and wisdom, could do the work effectually. The Church of Scotland had become so corrupt, that it pleased God not, as in our own case, to suffer it to be reformed, but entirely for a time to remove it. Meantime, the number of Protestants was increasing, especially in that class of persons who expected to have a share in the spoliation of the Church. Knox after a few months' stay in Geneva, re-visited Scotland, being desirous to see his wife. He persuaded the Protestants to separate entirely from the Catholic Church, the ordinances of which they had hitherto occasionally attended. He formed a powerful party. He ventured to write a letter to the queen, who treated it as a trifling occurrence, which irritated his temper, and led him to publish it with additions. The queen handed the letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, saying, *Please you, my lord, to read a pasquil.*

This provoked Knox to write thus:—"As charities (in these additions) persuadeth me to interpret thinges doubtfully spoken in the best sence, so my dutie to God, (Who hath commanded me to flatter no prince in the earth) compelleth me to say, that if no more ye esteeme the admonition of God nor the Cardinales do the scoffing of pasquilles, then He shall shortly send you messagers, with whome ye shall not be able on that manner to jest.—I did not speak unto you, Madame, by my former lettre, nether yet do I now, as Pasquillus doth to the Pope, in behalf of such as dare not utter their names; but I come, in the name of Jesus Christ, affirming, that the religion which ye maintain is damnable idolatrie: the which I offre myselve to prove by the most evident testimonies of Goddis scriptures. And, in this quarrelle, I present myself againste all the papistes

within the realme, desiring none other armore but Goddis holie worde, and the libertie of my tonge."

It is not to be wondered at that the queen regent should not entertain so high an opinion of such a man's religion as to feel inclined at his suggestion to change that in which she had been educated.

While Knox was thus occupied in Scotland, he received letters from the English congregation at Geneva, earnestly intreating him to go there; accordingly, July, 1556, he left Scotland, went first to Dieppe in France, and thence to Geneva. He had no sooner turned his back than the bishops summoned him to appear before them; and, upon his non-appearance, passed sentence of death upon him for heresy, and burnt him in effigy at the Cross at Edinburgh. Against this sentence, he drew up, and afterwards printed, at Geneva, in 1558, "An Appellation from the cruel and unjust Sentence pronounced against him by the false bishops and clergy of Scotland," &c. He had a call to Scotland, in 1557; and having consulted Calvin and other persons as to the prudence and necessity of the step, he set out, and had proceeded as far as Dieppe, when he was advised that some of his best friends seemed, through timidity, to be abandoning their principles, and that therefore it would not be safe for him to proceed. He immediately wrote letters to those who had invited him, complaining of their irresolution, and even denouncing the severe judgments of God on all those who should betray the cause of truth and of their country, by weakness and apostacy. These letters made such an impression on those to whom they were immediately addressed, that they all came to a written resolution, "that they would follow forth their purpose, and commit themselves, and whatever God had given them, into His hands, rather than suffer idolatry to reign, and the subjects to be defrauded of the only food of their souls." To secure each other's fidelity to the Protestant

cause, a common bond, or covenant, was entered into by them, dated at Edinburgh, December 3rd, 1557; and from this period they were distinguished by the name of "The Congregation." In the meantime, Knox returned to Geneva, where, in 1558, he published his treatise, entitled "The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women." His chief motive to write this, was the cruel and bloody government of Queen Mary of England, and the endeavours of Mary of Loraine, queen-regent of Scotland, to break through the laws, and introduce tyrannical government.

His remarks on Queen Mary have been given before. He had designed to write a second blast, but on the death of Queen Mary, he proceeded no further in his intention. But before the queen's death, he published at Geneva, in 1558, an advertisement concerning the second blast, as follows:—"John Knoxe to the reader.—Because many are offended at the First Blast of the Trompett, in which I affirme, that to promotte a woman to bear rule or empire above any realme, nation, or citie, is repugnant to nature, contumlie to God, and a thing most contrariouse to His revealed and approved ordinance: and because also that somme hath promised (as I understand,) a confutation of the same, I have delayed the Second Blast, tyll such time as their reasons appere, by the which I either may be reformed in opinion, or els shall have further occasion more simply and plainly to utter my judgment. Yet in the meane tyme, for the discharge of my conscience, and for avoyding suspition, which might be ingender'd by reason of my silence, I could not cease to notify these subsequent propositions, which by God's grace I purpose to entreat in the Second Blast promised.

"1. It is not birth onely, nor propinquity of blood, that maketh a king lawfully to reigne above a people, professing Christe Jesus, and His eternal veritie; but in



his election, must the ordenance which God hath established in the election of inferior judges, be observed.

“2. No manifest idolater, nor notorious transgressor of God’s holy precepts, ought to be promoted to anie publick regiment, honour, or dignitie, in any realme, province, or citie, that hath subjected themself to Christe Jesus, and to His blessed Evangil.

“3. Neither can othe nor promisse bynd any such people to obey and maintein tyrantes against God and against his trueth knowen.

“4 But if either rashely they have promoted any manifest wicked personne, or yet ignorantly have chosen such a one, as after declareth himself unworthie of regiment above the people of God, (and suche be all idolaters and cruel persecutors) most justlie may the same men depose and punish him, that unadvisedly before they did nominate, appoint, and elect.”

In April, 1559, he determined to return to Scotland, where the queen-regent, who for a time had sought to temporize with the Protestants, had now shewn a determination to repress them, as they had a determination to resist her authority.

Knox desired to pass through England, when Elizabeth was now on the throne, and sought to pave the way by palliating the doctrine he had propounded against female government, with the convenient supposition of a *Providential* right, on which hypothesis, he says to Cecil, “if any think me either enemy to the person or regiment of her whom God hath now promoted, they are utterly deceived in me; for the miraculous work of God, comforting His afflicted by an infirm vessel, I do acknowledge, and I will obey the power of His most potent hand, raising up whom best pleaseth His mercy, to suppress such as fight against His glory, albeit that nature and God’s most perfect ordinance repugneth to such regiment,” &c. This is a sufficient proof of the man’s versatile genius,

and what confidence he had in his own abilities, on any side of a question which he should see convenient to espouse.

Having, therefore, by this seasonable piece of sophistical flattery, opened a door for the freedom of getting home, and for answering any other exigencies that might occur, he took his departure from Dieppe, and on the second of May reached Edinburgh, where staying only two nights, he proceeded to Dundee, to comfort the brethren there, and from thence to Perth, where the convention above mentioned had assembled. This was a very critical juncture, and the presence of such a powerful and zealous orator was most acceptable; so upon the 11th of May, being called upon to mount the pulpit, he failed not to declaim on the usual theme of idolatry, and to shew what positive precepts there were for destroying all instruments and places of it. Immediately after sermon, one of the established clergy very foolishly ventured to expose an image that was in the kirk, to try how the people's affections stood that way, after Knox's vehement harangue on the subject. At this, one of the bystanders expressing some disgust, the priest rashly gave him a blow, and in return the other threw a stone and broke the image. The enraged populace looked upon this as a signal for attack; some fell upon the priest, who had much to do to escape with his life, others ran to the altar, and defaced whatever had the appearance of superstition. In a little while great numbers assembled, "not of the gentlemen, nor of such as were earnest professors," says Knox, "but of the rascally multitude," and finding nothing to do in the town's church, they ran to the Franciscan and Dominican monasteries, which they burst open, and soon spoiled of all that was in them, leaving nothing but the bare walls. From them they marched in triumph to the Carthusian monastery, commonly called the Charterhouse, which they plundered in like man-

ner, and then so completely demolished that noble building, that in two days scarcely a vestige of it was to be seen. Knox boasts much of the disinterestedness of this rascally multitude, as he calls them, in laying no hand on the rich spoil for themselves, "their consciences," he says, "being so beaten with the word, that they had no respect to their own particular profit, but only to abolish idolatry and all places and monuments thereof:" and the modern admirers of these doings still lay hold of this, as a glorious instance of self-denial in these conscientious reformers. Though after all, there seems to be nothing in it but what may be easily accounted for, from the unpremeditated fury of a thoughtless mob, whether Popish or Protestant, and which has been exemplified by all professions, both before that time and since, upon sundry occasions, where it has been seen, that a present fit of zeal or ill-nature, when it has silenced conscience, has got the better of avarice also. Precisely the same language was used with reference to the infidel mob, in the late Revolution in France.

However the destroying work was now begun; and this attempt at Perth, as it was the first-fruits of Knox's appearance after his return from exile, before which we find no symptom of such a daring and riotous spirit, so it was an introduction to all the lawless and unchristian violence of the kind that followed.

After this bold and shameful step towards a reformation at Perth, most of the stranger people we are told went home, and Knox was left in the town to instruct the flock, because, as he says, and it is the truest character he could give them, whatever meaning he had under it, "they were young and rude in Christ." What the nature of his instructions was, we may judge from the effects they produced. In the meantime, the congregation understanding that the Regent was making preparations for punishing this riotous insur-



rection, re-assembled at Perth, and wrote a letter to her in such terms as, instead of craving pardon for the outrage of a foolish mob, seemed designed rather to vindicate what they had done, and openly dare and defy the magistrate. Nor is this much to be wondered at, if we consider that the Church, in which they had been bred, had been at pains, through a course of years, by exalting the spiritual power above the temporal, to sink the sovereign in the people's eyes, and to diminish the respect due to him, wherever what they were pleased to call religion was concerned.

Besides this letter to the Regent, they wrote also to the commander of the French forces in Scotland, warning him not to proceed to harsh measures against them: and to the nobility who were at court, justifying what they had done at Perth, as being done at God's commandment, and telling them, that "though all authority established by God is good, and to be obeyed of all men, under pain of damnation, yet they ought to understand there is a great difference between the authority, and the persons of those "placed in authority:" and that the churchmen might not pretend they had been taken unawares, they directed a letter to them too, under this peculiar address, "To the generation of anti-christ, the pestilent prelates, and their shavelings within Scotland, the congregation of Christ Jesus within the same faith;" ordering them to desist from their former cruelties, and threatening them with the severest vengeance of retaliation, if they did not. Notwithstanding all this, the Regent made ready her forces to attack Perth; but by the mediation of friends, a compromise was made, in consequence of which she got access to it in a peaceable manner, and the congregation left it, after having entered into a new bond of association, on the last day of May.

Here again the Regent unluckily took some measures which the opposite party deemed a breach of the agree-

ment, on which the Earl of Argyle and the Prior of St. Andrews, who, though of the congregation, had hitherto adhered to the queen, deserted her and joined their friends. On the 4th of June, the Regent with her small army went to Falkland, and the lords of the congregation, with Knox in their company, moved to Crail, where on the 9th he preached, and on the 10th at Anstruther, in both which towns his preaching brought about the breaking down of altars and images, "but still," he says, "with more anger than avarice." On the morrow being Sunday, he marched with his party to St. Andrews; and there in fulfilment of a prediction which now for the first time he boasts of having made in his exile, that he would preach there in open audience before he died, and in despite of the archbishop, who, though attended with a hundred men in arms, durst not oppose him, he preached such a sermon, on the subject of our Saviour's driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple, that immediately after the people spoiled all the churches in the town, and levelled the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries to the ground. Let it be observed here, that this was done on a Sunday, under Knox's eye and at his instigation, and that too not by a "rascally multitude," as at Perth, but by the provost and baillies, with the whole town at their heels. Was this employment for the Lord's day? Was it a work either of necessity or mercy? Or, had it been both, might it not have been deferred till the morrow? Could there have been a greater profanation of the Sabbath, than this? And how would Knox have thundered out all the curses of Scripture, and all the oratory of Billingsgate, against a less profanation of it in an opposite cause? Besides, the impudent application of our Saviour's example, Who was Lord of the Sabbath and temple both, and had hereditary right to turn whom He pleased out of His Father's house, did that example either entitle or warrant Knox and his party to throw

down the house, because of the corrupt use that was made of it? But it was his order, and in those days that was enough, on Sunday or any day, to destroy whatever he thought fit to call idolatry.

When account of this havock was brought to the Regent at Falkland, she marched on the morrow with her troops towards Cupar, and was met by the other party with their army, at a moor near that town. But without coming to an engagement, another cessation of hostilities was patched up, and both armies retired. Meantime, the people of Perth were complaining of the hardships which they suffered from the queen's garrison there, upon which the lords marched in a body to their relief, and on the 25th being Sunday again, they drove out the garrison, and re-installed Lord Ruthven in the provostship of the town. The next day they destroyed the fine abbey and royal palace of Scoon in that neighbourhood, with the Bishop of Moray's lodgings, in spite of Knox's pretended remonstrances against it. From this exploit they posted next to Stirling, to prevent the Regent's getting possession of that pass, and there destroyed all the religious places and among the rest the famous abbey of Cambuskenneth. After three days abode at Stirling, on this desolating business, they set forward to Edinburgh, for reformation to be made there, as Knox calls it. But, by the way, they halted a little at Linlithgow, where they made the same thorough work as at Sterling. And though they were not above three hundred in number, their approach struck such a terror at Edinburgh, that the queen and Lord Seton the provost, left the city to the will of the reforming party in it, who, before the end of June that the lords from Stirling came up, had ruined all the monasteries in and about the town, except the abbey of Holyrood House, which they only plundered, "so that," says Knox, "we were the less troubled with putting order to these places."



From this time Knox devoted himself to the establishment of his religious opinions by rebellion. The doctrine he and his fraternity propounded was,—“that princes ought to be honoured and obeyed, even for conscience sake, provided they commanded nothing expressly repugnant to God’s commandment, and plainly revealed will. But, that if wicked persons move princes to command things manifestly wicked ; in this case they affirmed that such as can, and do, bridle those inordinate appetites of such misled princes, cannot be accused as resistaries of the authority which is God’s good ordinance :—to bridle the rage and fury of misled princes in free kingdoms and realms, appertains to the nobility, and also to the barons and people, whose votes and consent are to be required in all great and weighty matters of the commonwealth ; which if they do not, they declare themselves criminal with their misled princes, and so subject to the same vengeance of God which they deserve, for that they pollute the seat of justice, and do as it were, make God the author of iniquity.”

By this doctrine, the nobility and people have full liberty to resist upon the score of mal-administration ; and when that happens, themselves are the only judges ; so that in short, they are to be governed no longer than they think fit. But this is not the hardest part of the case, for if the prince fall into mal-administration, if he presses upon property, or countenances a religion the people do not like, they are then under a necessity of embroiling the government, of fighting against their sovereign, and redressing their grievances by force. If the nobility and persons of condition do not head the peasantry, and go all this length, they are said to have a share in their prince’s guilt, they are false to their trust, they pollute the seat of justice, and make God as it were, the author of iniquity.

Knox now in arms against his sovereign, became the

prime agitator by his sermons, and the director of those who had the chief management of the rebellion. At his suggestion the rebels sought for assistance from England, and Knox, like a good politician, apologized for his libel against female government. His political principles were not under the controul of very sound morality. The English government was unwilling to involve itself in a war with France by rendering assistance to the Scotch, upon which, in a letter to Sir James Croft the agitator, forgetting his character of religious reformer, observed, "If ye list to craft without thame, the sending of a thousand or mo men to us can brake no league nor point of peace contracted between you and France: for it is free from your subjects to serve in warr anie prince or nation for their wages; and if yee fear that such excuses will not prevail, ye may declare thame rebelles to your realme when ye shall be assured that thei be in our companye."

Dr. M'Crie only undertakes the defence of Knox here on the ground that other persons of the reforming party were as bad. But the impartial historian must pause to consider how such a sentiment would have been treated had it been uttered by Cardinal Beaton. Like other rebels, Knox, and the congregation, were led to do more than they at first intended; and having assembled nobles, barons, and representatives of the boroughs at Edinburgh, they formed a parliament similar to that which Mr. O'Connell, a more scrupulous agitator than Knox, proposed to convene in Dublin: by the advice of Knox and his preachers, this assembly proceeded to act as if it had been legally convoked, and deposed the queen regent.

After this the affairs of the congregation began to assume a less prosperous aspect, and Knox proclaimed his discovery, that although religion had been the plea of rebellion, the rebels themselves, and especially their leaders, were not all of them godly men. He thus

accounted for their disasters, and prevented their consciences from suspecting rebellion to be a sin.

Soon after the accession of Queen Mary's husband to the throne of France, a treaty was formed between the government and the Protestant rebels, but there was no particular settlement with respect to religion. The Protestants were now the most powerful party in the state, both in rank and numbers; still the Catholic Church was established by law, though Protestants, wherever their armies had possession, usurped the pulpits. According to the terms of the treaty, a free parliament was called, and on the 24th of August, 1560, this parliament abolished the Papal dominion, and prohibited, under severe penalties, the celebration of mass. It is to be remarked that these advocates for liberty of conscience decreed that the sayers and hearers of mass were, for the first fault, to suffer confiscation of goods, and corporal punishment; for the second, banishment; and for the third, death. All the laws in favour of the Catholic Church, and against Protestantism, were rescinded. The Catholic clergy seem to have yielded with scarcely a struggle, and the Catholic Church was for many years in abeyance in Scotland. That Confession of Faith was also adopted which lasted in Scotland until it was superseded by the Westminster Confession.

Whether these acts were legal is disputed, for the treaty excepted any reference to religion in the parliament, and it does not appear that these acts received the royal assent.

The Church having been dissolved, Knox and his friends perceived the necessity of having some regulations for their new society. It is a mistake to suppose that the present Presbyterian system was entirely adopted by Knox, for he permitted certain superintendents to be appointed, though this perhaps was only intended as a temporary measure; he himself acted as



a kind of pope directing the whole. The superintendents and preachers generally were appointed without imposition of hands, which clearly shews, that even if Presbyterian ordination could preserve the apostolical succession, that succession has been lost in the Scottish Kirk. He introduced an ordinance which he styled the Lord's Supper, but different from the Eucharist, as celebrated in Catholic Churches. This was arranged by the first "Book of Discipline," which, though nominally the work of six, was principally drawn up by Knox. The book was submitted to the general assembly, by whom it was approved, and it was then laid before the privy council. Here it was opposed on rational grounds. The authors of the "Book of Discipline" wished to apply to the purposes of Protestantism the confiscated revenues of the Catholic Church. The Protestant ministers could have no more right to the broad lands or tithes by which Catholicism had been endowed, than the lay lords; many of whom, according to Knox, became reformers with the chief object of obtaining the property. The property of the Church had been confiscated by the state, and the state might now as fairly appropriate it, or the rebel lords, now triumphant, scramble for it. The Protestant ministers had no claim upon it, and the claim of the Catholics was not admitted. In England the case was different, there the Catholic Church was not destroyed but reformed, and it is as Catholics that the clergy of the Church of England establish their title to their estates. The estate belongs to a man when he is young, middle-aged, and old; when his face has been washed, just as much as when he was dirty: he may be placed under different circumstances, but he is the same man. But when the robber has killed the owner of an estate, he may take away the property by violence, but he can establish no claim to it. And the Protestants in Scotland not being as in England, Catholics also, had now

destroyed the Church in that country; and their ministers were not the legal heirs of the vested clergy. Whatever, therefore, may have been the motives of the lay Protestants of Scotland, they had as much right to the lands they had won by injustice, robbery, and wrong, as Knox and the preachers, who shared their crime.

In August 1561, the widowed Queen of Scots arrived in her kingdom. She was received with enthusiasm, and her conduct was such, that by the wisdom of her ministers, and her own conciliating manner, she seemed for a time to have established order, and to have discovered the art of governing a rude and intractable people. But she was pursued by the bitter hatred of John Knox. The toleration she allowed to others she claimed for herself. And mass was performed in her own chapel. She was on this account violently assailed by Knox, who declared, that "One mass was more frightful to him than ten thousand armed enemies, landed in any part of the realm." The insults she received from the Presbyterians generally, are not to be described. Lord Lindsey and the gentlemen of Fife exclaimed, that "The idolater should die the death!" "But," observes Hume, "the ringleader in all these insults on majesty was John Knox; who possessed an uncontrolled authority in the Church, and even in the civil affairs of the nation, and who triumphed in the contumelious usage of his sovereign. His usual appellation for the queen was Jezebel; and though she endeavoured, by the most gracious condescensions, to win his favour, all her insinuation could gain nothing on his obdurate heart. She promised him access to her whenever he demanded it; and she even desired him, if he found her blamable in any thing, to reprehend her freely in private, rather than vilify her in the pulpit before the whole people: but he plainly told her, that he had a public ministry intrusted to him; that if

she would come to church, she should there hear the gospel of truth; and that it was not his business to apply to every individual, nor had he leisure for that occupation. The political principles of the man, which he communicated to his brethren, were as full of sedition as his theological were of rage and bigotry. Though he once condescended so far as to tell the queen that he would submit to her, in the same manner as Paul did to Nero, he remained not long in this dutiful strain. He said to her, that ‘Samuel feared not to slay Agag the fat and delicate King of Amalek, whom King Saul had saved; neither spared Elias Jezebel’s false prophets and Baal’s priests, though King Ahab was present: Phineas,’ added he, ‘was no magistrate; yet feared he not to strike Cosbi and Zimri in the very act of filthy fornication. And so, madam, your grace may see that others than chief magistrates may lawfully inflict punishment on such crimes as are condemned by the law of God.’ Knox had formerly, during the reign of Mary of England, written a book against female succession to the crown: the title of it is, ‘The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Regiment of Women.’ He was too proud either to recant the tenets of this book, or even to apologize for them; and his conduct showed that he thought no more civility than loyalty due to any of the female sex.”

The whole of the life of Mary was, from the demeanour of these men, filled with bitterness and sorrow. This rustic apostle scruples not, in his history, to inform us, that he once treated her with such severity, that she lost all command of temper, and dissolved in tears before him: yet, so far from being moved with youth and beauty, and royal dignity reduced to that condition, he persevered in his insolent reproofs; and when he relates this incident, he discovers a visible pride and satisfaction in his own conduct.

That Mary had good grounds for dreading the ascen-



dancy of Knox no one can doubt, for if he had had her in his power, according to his principles, he would have had her murdered. In a conference with secretary Maitland, when the question was, whether the queen's mass ought to be suppressed, Knox, forgetful of his denunciation of the Romish persecutors in England, sternly said, "Idolatry ought not only to be suppressed, but the *idolater ought to die the death.*" "I know," answered Maitland, another Presbyterian trying to reconcile loyalty to Mary, with principles formerly maintained by him, "I know that the idolater ought to die, but by whom?" "By the people," rejoined Knox, "for the commandment was made to Israel, as ye may read, Hear, O Israel, saith the Lord, the statutes and commandments of the Lord thy God."

Although Knox was now the de-facto pope of Scotland, yet through the wise and prudent management of Mary, who was winning the nobility to loyalty, his influence as a statesman was declining. This led him to expose the selfishness and servility of the Presbyterian leaders, and his first wife Marjory Bowes being dead, to seek an alliance with the aristocracy, by marrying Margaret Stewart, daughter of Lord Ochiltree, a lady of royal blood. Some writers say that he had previously paid his addresses to Lady Barbara Hamilton, eldest daughter of the Duke of Chastelhesault. But while he was establishing his family he was perplexed with regard to the other Presbyterian preachers, many of whom threatened to abandon their employment, on account of the non-payment of their stipend: he encouraged them by a "comfortable letter."

But Mary's unfortunate marriage with Darnley once more afforded Knox an opportunity to agitate. Darnley, a young man without any principles, was roughly treated by Knox, because to please the queen he sometimes went to mass, and to please the people sometimes to the Presbyterian sermons. But on a suspicion that the

queen was about to take active measures to suppress Presbyterianism, which had not presented its most amiable features to her majesty, and which must in her mind have been connected with disloyalty and rebellion, Darnley entered into a secret engagement with some of the Presbyterian nobles, of which the first effect was the barbarous assassination of David Rizzio, in the presence of the queen herself. This fresh murder brings disgrace enough on the Presbyterian cause in Scotland, but the disgrace is increased when we find the founder of Scottish Presbyterianism applauding the act. We have seen John Knox in early life consorting with assassins because they happened to be of the Protestant party, and we again find him, in this instance, if not the contriver, at least the approver of assassination. In his own account of it, as quoted by the historian, Skinner, he observes, that "by the death of David, the noblemen were relieved of their trouble, and restored to their places and rooms, and likewise the Church reformed, and all that professed the evangel within this realm, after fasting and prayer, were delivered and freed from the apparent dangers that were like to have fallen upon them." Great things these, to be sure, and all effectuated by the murder of a friendless stranger, and that murder executed on a Saturday night, by way of preparation for the work of the morrow, which Knox says was the second Sunday of their fast in Edinburgh; a fast indeed, which from this bloody scene in the midst of it, seems to answer too well the description reprobated by the prophet, of fasting "for strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness." And yet, thankful as Knox is for the deliverance of so many professors by this murder, which he diminutively calls "the death of David," he is forced to own that an equal number of as zealous professors were by it thrown into the same danger from which the others had been delivered.

He found it prudent under these circumstances to retire, and in his own phrase, he “stept west to Kyle,” his old sanctuary on any dangerous emergency. He also visited England, where his sons were educated. The education of his sons at an English university shews his want of confidence in his own institutions. He did not succeed in disturbing the Church of England, and returned disappointed to his own country, where he said of Queen Elizabeth, “she that now reigneth over them is neither good Protestant, nor yet resolute Papist, let the world judge what is the third.” The world has judged, and has decided that the third place is the mean in which Queen Elizabeth was found, the reformed Catholic Church.

During the time of Knox’s absence in England, the fatal tragedy of Darnley’s murder, so well known in Scottish history, was acted, and it led to a complete revolution in the government of the kingdom, and threw the power wholly into the hands of the Presbyterians. The queen’s disgraceful marriage with Bothwell strengthened the hands of her enemies; there was a confederation of the nobility to avenge Darnley’s death, and Mary was first confined a prisoner in Lochleven Castle, and afterwards forced to abdicate: her child was crowned king, and Knox, who hastened to join with the queen’s enemies, preached at the coronation, though he had to yield on a point of principle which sheds no lustre upon his character. Often as he had denounced the ministrations of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, he took part in the coronation service, though the Bishop of Orkney officiated on the occasion. He suspected that the people would not have regarded James as a king unless he were anointed, and unless that unction were administered by a minister whose orders were unquestionable. Knox contented himself with a childish objection to the anointing, as a Jewish ceremony.

The unfortunate lady who in prosperity had been the



object of his insults, could not in her misfortunes move his heart. The question is still under debate, whether Mary was or was not accessory to her husband's murder. Many authors of the highest character have always maintained her innocence. A Christian, therefore, ought at the very least, according to the apostolic definition of charity, to give her the benefit of the doubt. But Knox assumed her guilt, and when it was debated how her person was to be disposed of, and some proposed that she should be allowed to leave the kingdom, others that she should be imprisoned during life, the stern republican agitator, Knox, denounced her as deserving capital punishment. He thirsted for her blood.

The Earl of Murray was regent, and although the dethroned queen had warm friends throughout the country, Knox maintained his cause until he fell under the hand of an assassin, instigated by feelings of private revenge. The prevalence of this accursed crime is the disgrace of this portion of Scottish history.

This was a severe calamity to Knox, who preached the funeral sermon, and soon after Knox himself had a stroke of apoplexy. From this he recovered sufficiently to be able to resume his labours in the pulpit, but his health was now shaken, and his spirit was depressed by the attacks made upon his character by those Protestants who still adhered to the queen, and whose eyes were now opened to the violence and disloyalty of Knox's character. His friends would have had him pass over these attacks in silence, but he exhibited the sad sight of a violent old man, with one foot in the grave, prostituting the pulpit for the vindication of himself. On one occasion, he exclaimed, "One thing, in the end, I may not now pretermitt, that is, *to give him a lie in his throat* that either dare, or will say, that ever I sought support against my native country. What I have been to my country, albeit this unthankful age will not know, yet the ages to come will be com-

pelled to bear witness to the truth. And thus I cease, requiring of all men that has to oppose anything against me, that he will do it so plainly as I make myself and all my doings manifest to the world; for to me it seems a thing most unreasonable, that, in my decrepid age, I shall be compelled to fight against shadows and houlets that dare not abide the light."

It is sad indeed to see such a spirit in one who professed to be a religious man; and if he was a patriot, he must have deplored the miseries of civil war and intestine faction into which his country had been plunged, in great part through his violence, and long course of agitation. He was himself obliged to quit Edinburgh, which was occupied by the queen's friends, and go to St. Andrews. His pride was also mortified by a new scheme which the government adopted for altering the polity of his new kirk. The lay reformers desired this for the purpose of securing to themselves a better title than they possessed to the ecclesiastical revenues. The Regent and council proposed that the title of archbishop and other ecclesiastical dignitaries should be retained, that the bounds of the ancient dioceses should not be altered during the king's minority, and that qualified persons should be advanced to those dignities. But this in the eyes of a churchman was but a bastard Episcopacy, since no consecration was required, and therefore no apostolical succession obtained. By the Scottish people these bishops were called tulchan bishops, a tulchan being a calf's skin stuffed with straw, set up to make a cow give her milk freely; for these bishops were appointed that they might make over their lands with a title less likely to be disputed to the nobility. If the impartial historian cannot go so far as some of the Scottish Episcopalian writers, who would deduce from this act of a sordid government, a proof that the majority of Scottish reformers approved of Episcopacy, it at least shews that they were not bigoted

to Presbyterianism; and we are to remember that the *doctrine* of Episcopacy had not at that period been fully discussed.

To these innovations, as he called them, Knox was of course opposed; and he spoke with indignation of the avarice of the Protestant nobility. He was accused of being influenced by feelings of disappointment at not having had a bishopric offered him, but against this charge he defended himself in the pulpit, and in the general assembly held at St. Andrews, "opposed himself directly to the making of bishops."

Notwithstanding his bodily decay, his energetic and powerful mind still was busied in public affairs. The bitter mortification which was felt by Cardinal Wolsey at the close of life seems to have been experienced by Knox. It is melancholy to hear an old man who had devoted his life to the service of the world, exclaiming at the close of life, "*As the world is wearie of me, so am I of it.*"

He was removed from St. Andrews to Edinburgh, where he died, November 24, 1572.—*Spotiswood's Ecclesiastical History*. *M'Crie's Life of Knox*. *Collier*. *Hume*. *Skinner's Ecclesiastical History*. *Knox's Works*.

#### KORTHOLT, CHRISTIAN.

CHRISTIAN KORTHOLT was a native of Holstein, and born at Burg, in the Isle of Femeren, in the year 1633. At sixteen, he was sent to study at Sleswick; afterwards he was sent to the College of Stettin, and in 1652 he went to Rostock, from whence he proceeded to Jena, returning in a few months to Rostock, where he was made professor of Greek.

In 1664, he was invited to the theological chair at Kiel, of which university he was afterwards vice-chancellor. He died in 1694. His works are:—1. *Tractatus*



de persecutionibus Ecclesiæ Primitivæ. 2. Tractatus de Religione Ethnica, Mahummedana et Judaica, 4to. 3. Tractatus de Calumniis Paganorum in veteres Christianos. 4. De Origine et Natura Christianismi ex mente Gentilium. 5. De tribus Impostoribus Edvardo Herbert, Thomæ Hobbes, et Bened. Spinosæ, 4to. 6. De rationis cum revelatione in Theologia concursu. 7. Oratio de Scholarum et Academiarum ortu et progressu, presertim in Germania, folio. His grandson, Christian Kortholt, became professor of divinity at Gottingen, and died there in 1751, aged forty-two. He wrote an Account of the English Society of Antiquaries.

The principal among his Latin works are the following: De Ecclesiis suburbicariis; De Enthusiasmo Muhammedis; and several excellent Dissertations. The most esteemed of those in German are—a Treatise on the Truth of Christianity; Sermons, etc. He published four volumes of Latin Letters, by Leibnitz; a volume of his French Letters, and a collection of various pieces on Philosophy, Mathematics, History, etc., by the same author.—*Moreri*.

## KROMAYER, JEROME.

JEROME KROMAYER, nephew of the succeeding, was born at Zeitz, in 1610, and educated at the grammar-school there, and at Leipsic, Wittemberg, and Jena. In 1643, he was appointed professor of history and oratory, at Leipsic; and in 1657, he was appointed professor of divinity in ordinary; in the following year, canon of Zeitz, which in 1661, he exchanged for a similar dignity, at Meissen; in 1662, he was elected into the Decemviral College; and in 1666, he was nominated a member of the electoral and ducal consistory. Afterwards he succeeded to the chair of first professor of divinity. He died in 1670. He was the author of—*Commentaria in*

Epist. ad Galatas; Comment. in Apocalypsin; Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Centuriæ XVI.; Theologia Positivo-Polemica; Loci Antisyncretistici; Polymathia Theologica; some controversial Tracts; Dissertations, etc.—*Moreri*.

KROMAYER, JOHN.

JOHN KROMAYER was born at Dolblen, in Misnia, and educated at Stralsund, Butzback, Naumburg, and Leipsic. In 1600, he was made deacon, and sometime afterwards pastor, of the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, at Eisleben. The Duke of Weimar nominated him superintendent-general of the churches in that district, and the senate of the city chose him pastor of the Church of Weimar. He died in 1643. He wrote:—*Harmonia Evangelistarum*; *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Compendium*; *Specimen Fontium Scripturæ Sacræ apertorum*, etc.; *Examen Libri Christianæ Concordiæ*; A Paraphrase on the Prophecy and Lamentations of Jeremiah; this is held in high estimation, and is in the Bible of Weimar; Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the year, 4to; and, Sermons.—*Moreri*.

KYDERMYNSTER, OR KIDDERMINSTER, RICHARD.

RICHARD KYDERMYNSTER was born in Worcestershire, towards the latter end of the fifteenth century. When he was about fifteen years of age, he was received into the monastery of Benedictine monks at Winchcombe, in Gloucestershire, whence he was sent to Gloucester Hall, Oxford, which was then a school for young Benedictines. After studying there four years, he was recalled to his monastery, and made principal chaplain; and his good conduct led to his being chosen abbot in 1487. In 1500, he took his D.D. degree, at Oxford. He wrote:—

Tractatus contra Doctrinam Lutheri, 1521; one of the first attacks on that reformer's doctrines from this country; and a History of the Foundation of Winchcombe Monastery; a list of its abbots, and its charters and privileges. He died in 1531.—*Wood. Dod.*

## LABADIE, JOHN.

JOHN LABADIE, a turbulent fanatic, was born at Bonrig, in Guienne, in 1610. He was educated at the Jesuits' College at Bourdeaux, and himself became a Jesuit, but quitted the society in 1639, and became the leader of a sect of female devotees at Toulouse, where the archbishop gave him the direction of a convent. In 1650, he professed Calvinism, and sought an asylum at Geneva; from whence he removed to Middleburg, where he made a convert of Mademoiselle Schurman, and of Elizabeth, Princess Palatine. He now set up a new religion of his own, as different from Protestantism as the Catholic Church; and his followers went about Holland, making proselytes, particularly among the women. He died at Altena, in 1674. His works are numerous.—*Bayle. Niceron. Chaufepie. Moreri.*

## LABBE, PHILIP.

PHILIP LABBE was born in 1607, at Bourges. He was a Jesuit, and taught ethics, philosophy, and moral theology, with reputation, first at Bourges, and afterwards at Paris. He died March 25, 1667. His principal works are:—*Nova Bibliotheca MSS. Librorum*, 1657, 2 vols. fol., containing many pieces which had never been printed before; *De Historiæ Byzantinæ Scriptoribus publicandis Protrepticon*, 1648, fol.; *Two Lives of Galen*, taken from his works, 8vo; *Bibliotheca*



Bibliothecarum, 1686, 4to, with the Biblioth. nummaria, and an Auctuarium; Concordia Chronologica Technica et Historica, 5 vols. fol., the 5th vol. is by Père Briet; Bibliotheca anti-Janseniana, 4to, a catalogue of writings against Jansenius and his defenders; an edition of Notitia dignitatum omnium Imperii Romani, 12mo; De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis Dissertatio, 2 vols. 8vo, in which is a dissertation against the story of Pope Joan; Collection of the Councils, 1672, 17 vols. fol., with notes; to which is added an 18th vol., entitled, Apparatus alter, because the 17th is also entitled Apparatus. Of this collection, which is founded upon the Louvre edition of 1644, in 37 vols., Labbe published only the first eight volumes; the remainder of the work was finished by Cossart. This work, which is the basis of that of Hardouin, was very inaccurately printed at Venice, by N. Coleti, 1728, 25 vols. fol.—*Chaufepie. Nicéron.*

## LACTANTIUS.

THE name of this most eloquent of the Latin fathers, who flourished about the year 303, is now generally written Lucius Cœlius, or Cæcilius, Firmianus Lactantius. But whether the names Lucius and Cœlius, or Cæcilius, belong to him, may be questioned, as they are not given by any ancient writers who lived near his time; and they are generally wanting in the manuscript copies of his works, and in the most early printed editions. In this manner several learned men argue upon this point; whilst some others contend, that his name is rightly written as above.

The native country of Lactantius is not certainly known. Some have conjectured that he was born at Firmum, now Fermo, in Italy, and that from thence he was called Firmianus. But it is more generally supposed that he was an African.

We have a history of Lactantius by St. Jerome, in his "Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers." In this we are told that he was a scholar of Arnobius, who taught rhetoric at Sicca, in Africa. Being sent for in the time of the Emperor Diocletian, together with Flavius Grammaticus, whose books of medicine, written in verse, are still extant, he taught rhetoric at Nicomedia: but not having many scholars there, it being a Greek city, he betook himself to writing. We have his Banquet, which he wrote when very young; An Itinerary from Africa to Nicomedia, in hexameter verses; and another book, entitled Grammaticus; and an excellent book of the Wrath of God; and seven books of Divine Institutions against the Gentiles; and an Epitome of the same work in one book, the beginning of which is wanting; and two books to Asclepiades; Of the Persecution, one book; four books of Epistles to Probus; two books of Epistles to Severus; two books of Epistles to Demetrian, his scholar; and to the same, one book of the Workmanship of God, or the Formation of Man. In his old age he was preceptor to Crispus Cæsar, son of Constantine, in Gaul, who was afterwards put to death by his father.

It has been supposed by some that Lactantius was at first a heathen. Gallæus speaks of this as a point not to be disputed: Tillemont takes it for granted; and Dupin opines that he was converted in his youth. But Cellarius and Lardner incline to the opposite opinion. The date of his death is unknown. His principal work is entitled, "Institutionum Libri, vii.," and contains a confutation of the writings of two heathens of note, who had published works against the Christian religion at the commencement of the persecution under Diocletian. Cave and Lardner suppose the "Institutions" to have been composed about A. D. 306. Basnage and Dupin place them about A. D. 320. Of the preceding work there is also an abridgment, entitled, "Institutionum

Epitome," inscribed by Lactantius to his brother Petaudius. This was imperfect at the beginning, in St. Jerome's copy, and was so in those which reached modern times, till a perfect, or nearly perfect copy was found in the library of the King of Sardinia, at Turin, by Dr. Christopher Matthew Pfaff, and published by him at Paris, in 1712. In his treatise, "De Irâ Dei," which is particularly commended by Jerome, Lactantius endeavours to prove, that God is capable of anger as well as of mercy and compassion; and in his treatise, "De Opificio Dei," he establishes the doctrine of God's providence, by demonstrating the excellence of his principal work, which is man, giving an elegant description of the parts of the human body, and the properties or faculties of the soul. Respecting the well-known book, "De Mortibus Persecutorum," the learned world have been divided in opinion. It is a work which none of the ancients, after the time of Jerome, have noticed; and it was first published by Stephen Baluze, in the second volume of his "Miscellanea," in 1679. The first edition of the works of Lactantius was published at Rome, in 1468, fol., by Conrad Lewenheim; and the last, which is the most correct, was edited at Paris, in 1748, 2 vols. 4to., by the Abbé Lenglet. There is also an edition by Heumann, Göttingen, 1736. Lactantius also wrote:—An Itinerary from Africa to Nicomedia; a work entitled, Grammaticus; Two Books to Asclepiades; and Eight Books of Epistles, all of which are lost.—*Lactantius's Works* Lardner. Cave. Dupin. Tillemont.

#### LADVOCAT, JOHN BAPTIST.

JOHN BAPTIST LADVOCAT was born in 1709, at Vaucouleurs, and educated first under the Jesuits at Pont-a-Mousson, and afterwards at the seminary of St. Louis, at Paris, and at the Sorbonne, of which society he was



admitted a member, in 1736. In 1740, he was called by the Sorbonne, to fill one of its royal professorships, and in 1742 was made librarian. In 1751, he was appointed to the chair, founded at his suggestion, in the Sorbonne, by the Duke of Orleans, for the explanation of the Old Testament according to the Hebrew text, which station he held till his death, in 1765. He wrote:—*Dictionnaire Géographique portatif*; and, *Dictionnaire Historique portatif des grands Hommes*; this is an abridgment of Moreri, and is full of errors, 2 vols. 8vo. He also published a Hebrew Grammar, for the use of his pupils; *Tractatus de Conciliis in Genere*; and, *Lettre dans laquelle il examine si les Textes originaux de l'Ecriture sont corrompus, et si la Vulgate leur est préférable*. Ladvocat was, as an expositor of Scripture, a zealous disciple of Houbigant. He was also the correspondent of Dr. Kennicott, whose great work he zealously promoted, and he collated many MSS. for him in the Royal Library at Paris.—*Dict. Hist.*

## LAINEZ, JAMES.

JAMES LAINEZ, second general of the Jesuits, and one of those who most contributed to the elevation of that order, (*see the Life of Loyola,*) was born in 1512, at Almansor, a town in the diocese of Sigüenza, in Castile, of respectable parents, who gave him a Christian education. After having completed his humanity course, he went through a course of philosophy in the University of Alcalá, and received the degree of master of arts. From all that he heard of Ignatius Loyola, he greatly desired to become acquainted with him; and for this object, as well as to finish his theological studies, he went to Paris, where Ignatius had taken refuge from the researches of the Inquisition. As soon as he saw him, he resolved to follow his fortunes, and to go with

him into Turkey, where Ignatius intended to carry the tidings of the gospel. They met at Venice, in 1536, but circumstances prevented their departure, and they formed together the plan of what was afterwards the Jesuit Institution, a full account of which is given in the life of Loyola.

The institution having received the Papal sanction of Paul III., in 1540, Lainez induced Ignatius to accept the office of general, and traversed the principal towns of Italy in order to form colleges. He was deputed by the pope to the Council of Trent, where he signalized his zeal for the interests of the court of Rome. The council having been interrupted, he hastened back to Italy, and exerted himself to place companions of his order in those towns where they had not been admitted. He refused a cardinal's hat from Paul III., and when the Papal chair becoming vacant, he had the votes of several cardinals for the Pontificate. He succeeded Ignatius as general of their order, in 1558, and in 1561, he followed in the suite of the Cardinal of Ferrara, who went into France to devise some means of extirpating heresy. He spoke at the famous conference of Poissy, and on the avowal of an enemy of the society, (Linguelin) was the only one who talked reasonably; but parties were too hot to allow of a reconciliation. Although the conference of Poissy was a failure, yet Lainez had shewn himself in so favourable a light, that he obtained the introduction of his order into France without difficulty. He then returned for the third time to the Council of Trent. In this session he pronounced the famous harangue, in which he contended for Papal pre-eminence.

After the session, Father Lainez returned to Rome, borne down with fatigue. He pursued, however, the measures for the aggrandizement of his order with unabated ardour, until his increasing weakness shewed him that his end was approaching. He assembled all the companions of his order round him, gave them his

last instructions, and died the 19th of January, 1565, being only fifty-three years of age. His dying consolation was, that he left the society in so flourishing a condition; it was owing to his plans that it became so powerful and influential, and it fell from its high estate from reasons which may be seen in the life of Ignatius Loyola. It reappeared from its ruins, and was re-established by the bull of Pius VII.

Of his works, there is a letter among those of the Superiors-General of the Society; and orations, inserted in the minutes of the Council of Trent. He left several imperfect works on theological subjects. The eleventh volume of the History of the Jesuits, bears the name of Lainez, and his life was written in Spanish by Father Rebandeneira; it was translated into Latin by Andrew Scholt, and into French by Michael d'Esue, Lord of Bettancourt, Douai, 1597, in 8vo.—*See the Life of Ignatius Loyola for an account of the Jesuits. Biog. Universelle.*

## LAKE, ARTHUR.

ARTHUR LAKE was born at Southampton, in St. Michael's parish, and was educated at the free-school in that town, at Winchester School, and at New College, Oxford, of which he was admitted fellow in 1589. In 1594, he took his degrees in arts, and being ordained, was made fellow of Winchester College about 1600, and in 1603, master of the hospital of St. Cross. In 1605, he was installed Archdeacon of Surrey; in 1608, he was made Dean of Worcester; and in December, 1616, he was consecrated Bishop of Bath and Wells. He is highly commended by Fuller and Walton. He died in 1626. After his death there were published several volumes of his sermons; an Exposition of the First Psalm; an Exposition of the Fifty-first Psalm; and



Meditations; all of which were collected in 1 vol. fol., London, 1629. He was a considerable benefactor to the library of New College, where he also endowed two lectureships, one for the Hebrew language, and another for mathematics.—*Wood. Walton's Life of Sanderson.*

## LAKE, JOHN.

JOHN LAKE was born at Halifax, where he was baptized, December 5, 1624. He was educated at the Grammar School, at Halifax, and at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was admitted into the university before he was thirteen years of age. When he was a B.A., he was made a prisoner in his college with the royal party, but making his escape, he fled to Oxford, and continued four years in the king's army. When the royal cause was at the lowest, he refused the engagement with the same constancy with which he had previously rejected the covenant, and before the Restoration he was in Episcopal orders. On the 26th of July, 1647, he preached his first sermon as lecturer, at Halifax, and went after to Oudam, in 1652. Upon the death of Mr. Styles, he was presented to the vicarage of Leeds, but met with so much opposition from those who were for introducing Mr. Bowles, of York, that a party of soldiers was thought necessary to secure his induction, the church doors being barred against him by some of the younger opponents, which had like to have proved of ill consequence to the elder who were innocent. Being appointed to preach the first synod-sermon at York, he performed it with so great applause, that Dr. Hitch desired a copy of the sermon, and without his knowledge shewed it to Dr. Sheldon, Bishop of London, who soon after sent for, and made him Rector of St. Botolph's, in Bishopgate Street, to give an example of uniformity to the city at that juncture, for he was as strict in ob-

serving the canons and rubrics, as he was afterwards careful that others should observe them.

Here began (what he esteemed the principal honour and felicity of his life) his friendship with Dr. Sancroft, then Dean of St. Paul's, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who had a high esteem for him, and received him into his particular favour and affection. The sermon that he preached, July 15, 1669, at the funeral of Mr. William Cade, deputy of that ward, and a benefactor, "was extorted from the learned author, whose excessive modesty would have covered it with northern dust." It was printed in 1671, 4to., and entitled, ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ ΠΙΣΤΟΥ: or, "The True Christian's Character and Crown." A Sermon, preached at Whitehall, May 29, 1670, being the day of his majesty's birth and happy restoration, was also published, and by his majesty's command.

He had in the meantime returned to his native soil, and having been first instituted Rector of Prestwich, in Lancashire, he was collated to the prebend of Fridaythorpe, in the Cathedral and Metropolitcal Church of St. Peter, in York, July 16, 1670, and the same day to the prebend of Halloughton, in the Collegiate Church of St. Mary, in Southwell, and to the rectory of Carlton in Lindrick, both in Nottinghamshire. The more remarkable therefore is that eulogium, "he had many remarkable preferments, but none of his own seeking." He was now residentiary at York, and perhaps never any man was more useful and beneficial to that Church, either in asserting its liberties and recovering its rights, or in managing and securing the revenues, or in maintaining order and decency there. But endeavouring to break the ill custom of walking in the body of the cathedral during the time of divine service, (which was sometimes disturbed and almost interrupted by the loud rudeness of the vulgar,) he was insulted by the rabble, who after they had broken open

the south door of the minster, followed him home, assaulted him in his own house, and would probably have murdered him and plundered it, (having taken off a great deal of the tiling,) had he not been rescued by Captain Honeywood, deputy-governor. On May 7, 1671, he was collated to the mastership and custody of the hospital of St. Mary Magdalen, near Bawtry. On October 9, 1680, he was installed Archdeacon of Cleveland.

Being nominated by William, Earl of Derby, to the Bishopric of Man, he was consecrated, Dec., 1682, and thence, by King Charles II. he was translated to Bristol, August 12, 1684, with liberty to keep his prebend *in commendam*. The Archbishop of Canterbury highly approving his vigilant care over his clergy and diocese, and his wisdom and vigour in administering the discipline of the Church, chose him out as one most fit to be intrusted with a commission to visit the dioceses of Lichfield and Coventry; and some time after he held another archiepiscopal visitation at Salisbury, with the Bishop of Rochester, and other commissioners.

In the time of Monmouth's rebellion, his lordship being in parliament at London, King James II. considered that the presence of such a bishop whom he could so entirely confide in, and who was so well beloved in his diocese, would be infinitely serviceable to him in so important a place as Bristol, and therefore appointed that he should go thither. The bishop, as soon as he had notice of his majesty's pleasure, went accordingly with all readiness, though he was then so afflicted with the gout, that he was carried into his coach. In this painful and dangerous journey he narrowly escaped the rebel forces. The king was so well satisfied with his behaviour and conduct, that before his return he nominated him to the Bishopric of Chichester, where he succeeded Guy Carlton, in Aug. or Sept., 1685.



But afterwards his lordship lay under the same misfortune with most of the nobility and gentry, to have his duty and affection to the king misunderstood; being one of the seven bishops who, (says the author of his memoirs,) by their Christian courage and patience, disarmed the rage of our Popish adversaries, in the height of their pride and triumph, and had his share in the whole management of an affair as honourable as perhaps any thing that has been done in any age. After he had prevented the sending down the declarations into his own diocese, he went in haste to London, and joined himself in consultation with the rest of those bishops with whom he was committed prisoner to the Tower, June 8, 1688, *for contriving, making, and publishing a seditious Libel against his majesty, and his government*: that is, saith the Oxford historian, for subscribing a petition to the king, wherein they shewed the great averseness they found in themselves to the distributing and publishing the declaration for liberty of conscience. On June 15, they were brought to the king's-bench bar, arraigned, tried, and acquitted the 29th, to the great joy of the generality of the people. He had afterwards a very worthy part in those applications the bishops made to his majesty a little before the Revolution, when they interposed themselves as it were between the king and his people with all the humility and submission of subjects, yet with all the freedom and courage that were necessary to save the three kingdoms.

As he was consistent in his devotion to the Church's cause, opposing manfully the tyrannical acts of James II., so at the Revolution he was consistent to the monarchical principles which he had always professed. He became a nonjuror, and was deprived of his bishopric. But he did not long survive the Revolution, as he died on the 30th of August, 1689. (For an Account of the trial of the Seven Bishops, see the *Life of Sancroft*.)—*Thoresby's Vicaria Leodiensis*.

## LALLEMANT, JAMES PHILIP.

JAMES PHILIP LALLEMANT was born about 1600, at St. Valery, in Picardy. He was a Jesuit, and one of the most zealous defenders of the constitution Unigenitus. Besides a number of controversial tracts, he was the author of:—The true Spirit of the new Disciples of St. Augustine; The New Testament, in 12 vols. 12mo., with meditations and remarks, intended to counteract the effects of the celebrated and very popular work of Quesnel; this work is commended by Fenelon; and A Paraphrase on the Psalms, 12mo; this is very highly spoken of by Flechier. Lallemant died in 1748.—*Biog. Universelle.*

## LAMBERT, FRANCIS.

FRANCIS LAMBERT was born at Avignon, in 1487. At the age of fifteen he entered among the Friars Minors, or Franciscans, and continued in the community twenty years. In the course of his investigations he saw reasons to renounce the doctrines of the Romish Church, and to adopt those of the Reformation; and in 1522, he withdrew to Switzerland, where he became a popular preacher among the Protestants. After staying some time at Basle, he removed to Wittemberg, to visit Luther, with whom he grew into high esteem, and he received an appointment in the university. He next visited Metz, and Strasburgh. In 1527, he was chosen divinity professor at the University of Marburg; and in 1530, he died, at the age of forty-three.

He was the author of the Commentaries on Solomon's Song, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, and Habakkuk, 1525, 8vo; Exegesis in Apocalypsin, printed at Basil, in 1539, 8vo; Antithesis Verbi Dei,

et Inventorum Hominum, 1525, 8vo.; De Prophetia, Eruditione, Linguis, &c.; In Acta Apostolorum, et Libros Regum; Commentarii Evangelici in Regulam Minoritarum, &c., 8vo.; Farrago omnium fere Rerum Theologicarum, 8vo.; controversial treatises, &c.—*Bayle. Moreri.*

## LAMI, BERNARD.

BERNARD LAMI was born at Mans, in 1645, and educated in the college there. He studied rhetoric under Mascaron, and at the age of eighteen entered the congregation of the Oratory. He next taught the belles-lettres at Vendôme and Juilly, and philosophy at Saumur, and at Angers, till 1676, when he was deprived of his professorship for being a Cartesian, and his enemies having obtained a *lettre de cachet* against him, he was banished to Grenoble, where Cardinal le Camus, who had established a seminary for the education of ecclesiastics, and had a great esteem for Lami, appointed him professor of divinity. He was afterwards called by his superior to the seminary of St. Magliore, at Paris, where he remained till 1689, when he removed to Rouen, where he died in 1715.

His principal works are:—*Eléments de Géométrie, et de Mathématiques*; *Un Traité de Perspective*; *Entrétiens sur les Sciences, et sur la Méthode d'Etudier*; *Apparatus Biblicus*; the Abbé Boyer has translated this work into French, and there is an English translation by Bundy, in 4to., with fine plates, London, 1723, 4to. Lami published also a valuable work, the labour of thirty years, entitled, *De Tabernaculo Fœderis, de Sanctâ Civitate Jerusalem, et de Templo ejus*, fol.; *Démonstration, ou Preuves évidentes de la Vérité et Sainteté de la Morale Chrétienne*, 1706 to 1711, 5 vols. 12mo. He wrote also several works concerning the time in which



our Saviour kept the passover, &c., the largest of which is his *Harmonia sive Concordia quatuor Evangelistarum*, &c., Paris, 1689. He also left a *System of Rhetoric*; *Réflexions sur l'Art Poétique*; *Traité de Méchanique, de l'Equilibre*, &c., 1687. It was Lami's practice to travel on foot, and he composed his *Elements of Geometry and Mathematics*, in a journey from Grenoble to Paris.—*Moreri. Dupin.*

## LAMI, FRANCIS.

FRANCIS LAMI was born in 1636, at Montreau, near Chartres. He went first into the army, but entered the Benedictine order, in 1659. He died in 1711, at the Abbey of St. Denis, where he had spent upwards of twenty years. He wrote:—*Traité de la Connaissance de Soimène*, 1700, 6 vols. 12mo.; *Vérité evidente de la Religion Chrétienne*; *Nouvel Athéisme renversé*, against Spinoza; *L'Incrédule amené à la Religion par la Raison*; *Lettres théologiques et morales*; *Lettres philosophiques sur divers Sujets*; *Conjectures physiques sur divers Effets du Tonnerre*; with an addition published the same year; this tract is very curious; *De la Connaissance et de l'Amour de Dieu*; *La Rhétorique de Collège, trahie, par son Apologiste*, against the famous Gibert, professor of rhetoric in the Mazarin College; *Les Gémissemens de l'Ame sous la Tyrannie du Corps*; *Les premiers Eléments des Sciences, ou Entrée aux Connaissances solides*, to which is added an *Essay on Logic*, in form of dialogues; *A Letter to Malebranche on Disinterested Love*, with some other Letters on philosophical subjects; *A Refutation of M. Nicole's System of Universal Grace*. His style is generally polished and correct.—*Niceron. Moreri.*

## LAMPE, FREDERIC ADOLPHUS.

FREDERIC ADOLPHUS LAMPE was born at Dethmold, in the circle of Westphalia, in the year 1683. He received his primary education at Bremen; and afterwards studied successively in the Universities of Franeker and Utrecht. When he had finished his course of divinity, he first officiated in the Church of Wesel, in the territory of Cleves; whence he afterwards removed to Teutburg, and from that place to Bremen. In the year 1720, he accepted an invitation to Utrecht, to fill the chair of professor of divinity; and in addition to that post, in the year 1726, he was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history. In the following year, however, he was again induced to settle at Bremen; where he had the appointment of professor of divinity in ordinary; he was also perpetual rector of the university, and pastor of a church. These advantages and honours he enjoyed but a very short time, being carried off by a violent hemorrhage, in 1729, when only forty-six years of age. He wrote:—*De Cymbalis veterum Libri tres; Synopsis Historiæ sacræ et ecclesiasticæ, ab Origine Mundi ad præsentia Tempora, secundum Seriem periodorum deductæ; Commentarius Analytico-exegeticus Evangelii secundum Joannem.* Fabricius pronounces this to be a very learned work; it was afterwards translated into German.—*Mereri. Biog. Universelle.*

## LAMPLUGH, THOMAS.

THOMAS LAMPLUGH was born in Yorkshire, in 1615, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, of which he became a fellow in 1642. As a theologian he is unknown. As a politician he was willing to co-operate with any party in the ascendant. During the civil

wars, he was a republican. At the Restoration, he was a royalist, and he became head of Alban Hall, and rector of St. Martin's-in-the-fields. In 1672, he obtained the deanery of Rochester; in 1676, he was consecrated Bishop of Exeter. When the Prince of Orange appeared to deliver our Church and nation from Popery and tyranny, Bishop Lamplugh exhorted the people to defend the cause of James II. But when the Prince of Orange was elected king, Bishop Lamplugh crowned him, and from him received the Archbishopric of York. He died in 1691.

## LANFRANC.

LANFRANC was born at Pavia, in 1005, being descended from a noble family in Lombardy. He studied at Bologna, and when his studies were completed, returned to his native place, where he practised as an advocate. Thinking this, however, too narrow a sphere, he entered into holy orders, and removed into France, and taught for some time at Avranches; this was the first seat of his literary fame. But the civilization of Normandy had been but little advanced by the invasion of the Normans, and as that land was still most deficient in literature and the arts, his reputation, he thought, would here be considerably increased, since all others fell so far below him. In his journey to Normandy, he was accompanied by some of his scholars. On his road towards Rouen, Lanfranc, with one of these scholars in his passage through a wood, was seized by robbers, who despoiled him of every thing saving his coat. In this situation he bethought himself of the conduct of a saintly man, who, travelling on horse-back at the time of the invasion of Italy by the Lombards, was robbed, by some of their number, of his horse, and who, being mindful of the precept of Christ, instantly gave him his



whip, wherewith they might govern the animal, which conduct so much moved the Lombards, that they immediately restored him his horse. Relying on equal success, Lanfranc offered the robbers his coat. They, viewing his conduct as contemptuous haughtiness, became enraged, and taking his coat, bound him and his companion to two trees which were at some distance from the road. It was night; he now began to consider the reason why he had succeeded so differently from the man whose conduct he had taken for his model. This, he saw was the cause: the act of the other had sprung from patience and magnanimity, his from mere craftiness. When thus bound to the tree, he remembered that other men prayed in misfortune; he, therefore, wished to pray; but as his prayers were unavailing, he addressed a hymn to the Almighty. He might, perhaps, somewhere have heard or read of men so exalted above adversity, as to praise God in the midst of their calamities. This his situation penetrated to his very soul; he felt how little he had as yet corresponded with his priestly character, and how melancholy it was that, with all his learning, he did not yet know how to pray; and, in conclusion, he vowed that on recovering his liberty he would consecrate his remaining life to serve God in the monastic state.

Being released from durance the following morning, he made inquiry for the poorest monastery and was directed to Bec. The history of the foundation of this establishment, afterwards so famous, is remarkable. At the court of the powerful Duke of Normandy, there dwelt a noble knight of the name of Helluin. By his father he was related to the duke, and by his mother he claimed descent from the Dukes of Flanders; and adding to this nobility of birth great prowess in arms, as well as courtesy in manners, he soon gained the affection of all acquaintance. Suddenly, a total change in his conduct became manifest; no longer would he join his former

companions—no longer maintain his admired decency in dress; but, flying all pleasure and society, he indulged in the deepest reflections. Long did he hesitate as to what conduct he should pursue to free himself from this melancholy disposition; at last, being deterred from entering any monastery, as was first his resolution, by the uncouth manners of the inmates, he resolved to become himself the founder of a new institute. Being joined by many others, they determined to adopt the code of St. Benedict, in all its severity. Having raised a church for the convenience of his monastery, he immediately entered on his destined life. After the religious offices of the morning, he employed himself, together with his companions, in the labours of husbandry and gardening. There was yet one important thing wanting, and this was an individual who might wash their clothing; and this much-required person they found in the mother of Helluin. Such was the commencement of the renowned monastery of Bec.

If these men were fanatics whose fanaticism took the peculiar form of that age, allowance must be made for them on the ground of their being entirely uneducated. Helluin could not even read, when he entered upon his retirement. But his duty, as abbot, of teaching the Scriptures, made this accomplishment indispensable. As, therefore, in the day he was engaged in the fields, he spent his nights in the study of the gospel. And gladly did Helluin, whom Lanfranc, on approaching, found engaged in building an oven, rejoice in the acquisition of so learned a monk. Helluin himself had already become well-versed in the Scriptures, and had made so great advances in the spiritual life, as considerably to excite the admiration of Lanfranc, by the explanations he gave him. The abbot honoured Lanfranc on account of his learning, and raised him to the priorship, thus making him partake of the offices of the cloister. Lanfranc had spent

three years in deep solitude, engaged with the higher studies, when the retirement of this celebrated man was once more discovered. Scholars from all quarters immediately flocked to Bec; clergymen, as well as professors from the most celebrated schools; knights, no less than the sons of the first of the nobility; to all a gratuitous education was given.

Mr. Hallam doubts whether Lanfranc deserves the high character which he bore for learning, if by learning we have regard only or chiefly to the classics. It is certain, however, that his knowledge of the Latin tongue was superior to that of any of his contemporaries; he was not unacquainted with Greek, and his familiarity with dialects was truly astonishing; no branch of literature cultivated at the time did he leave untouched.

His reputation soon recommended him to the notice of that extraordinary person, the patron of learning and of learned men, William, Duke of Normandy, who in a short time made him his chief counsellor.

Under the pontificate of Leo IX., Lanfranc went to Rome, and not long after he assisted at the Council of Verceil, where he defended the then novel doctrine of Transubstantiation against the sounder views of Berengarius, to whose life the reader is referred for a history of this controversy. In 1059, he went to Rome a second time, and assisted at the Council of the Lateran, before which the unfortunate Berengarius was weak enough to renounce his opinions. But his chief object in this journey was to solicit a dispensation for the marriage of Duke William with the daughter of the Earl of Flanders; a marriage which he had himself, in the absence of a dispensation, opposed. As usual with the court of Rome, the right to grant the dispensation was assumed by the popes; and the dispensation was soon obtained, on the condition that the duke and his lady should build a monastery. The monastery was



built; and of the monastery of St. Stephen, at Caen, Lanfranc was appointed abbot in 1063, and established a new academy, which soon became famous.

When Lanfranc's friend and patron, William, Duke of Normandy, was seated on the English throne, he formed the design of depriving the most eminent of the clergy of the Church of England of their dignities in the Church, in order to confer them on his own countrymen, and upon those on whose attachment he could depend. To accomplish this design, iniquitous as it was, he determined to apply to the pope to send legates into England, to regulate the affairs of the English Church, which he pretended were in great disorder, and Lanfranc was dispatched to negotiate on the subject with Alexander II. The pope was too happy to interfere in a Church over which he had no lawful jurisdiction. Two cardinal priests came over as legates, and held a council of the clergy of the Church of England at Winchester, on the octaves of Easter, 1070, in the presence of the king. In this council, among other dignified clergy and prelates, Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury was deposed. To this see the conqueror appointed his friend, Lanfranc, who very naturally felt disinclined to enter upon so arduous an office, ignorant as he was of the language and customs of the people; but being persuaded or commanded to accept the post by Alexander II., he was consecrated on the 29th of August, 1070. Lanfranc, and the other foreigners, who were exalted by the fall, and enriched by the spoils of the unhappy English, did not long continue in a state of harmony amongst themselves, but a most violent quarrel broke out between the two archbishops about the primacy. When Thomas, elect of York, came to Canterbury to be consecrated, Lanfranc, on the day appointed for the ceremony, demanded of him an oath, and written profession of canonical obedience to himself and successors, as primates of all England; which the

other absolutely refusing, departed in great anger, without being consecrated. But Lanfranc having convinced the king and his council of the justice of his claim, Thomas was commanded to return, and take the oath, and make a profession of obedience to Lanfranc, without mentioning his successors; and with this command he thought proper to comply.

The two archbishops applied for that empty honour, the pallium or pall, to the Pope of Rome. The pall, originally an imperial vestment reaching to the feet, had by degrees dwindled into an ornamented band with a pendant before and behind. What had been originally a gorgeous robe, had become a mere ornament; the form of which may be seen in the archiepiscopal arms of Canterbury, Armagh, and Dublin. It was originally granted by the emperors to certain prelates; and by the emperors the power of granting it was conceded to the Popes of Rome. It was like the granting of a star and ribbon in modern times, a mere personal gratification. But it was made a stepping stone to Papal usurpation. The popes were accustomed to confer it upon primates, and assumed that it was a mark of the subjection of all primates to the see of Rome, denying even the right of a primate to discharge the functions of his high office until he had received the pall. The archbishops were not at this time accustomed to solicit the pall in person, though this at one period had been the practice. Hildebrand, who now governed the court of Rome, saw at once that the revival of this practice would contribute to the subjugation of all Churches to the Roman See, the object he had at heart; and therefore on Lanfranc's application for the pall, he undertook the charge of replying to his request, and in a letter to that prelate expressed, in the strongest terms, his regret that it could not be complied with. "Could any case," he said, "have authorized a departure from the proper

practice, Lanfranc, deserving as he was of the regard of the papal see, should undoubtedly have received the favour in question, without having to solicit it. But it was most essential that the old rule should be restored and maintained. The holy see was anxious too, on various points, for the benefit of the English archbishop's counsels. It was hoped, therefore, that, by complying with the directions which papal envoys were commissioned to bear to him, he would adopt a line of conduct meet for a dear son of the Church, and a pious member of the clerical order." This epistle produced its intended effect; and in 1071, Lanfranc, with Thomas, who had been promoted, in 1070, to the metropolitan see of York, presented himself in due form before the apostolic threshold, where Alexander received him with most distinguished honour. As Lanfranc approached, the pontiff paid him the unusual compliment of rising from his seat to meet him, declaring at the same time that he did so in honour, not of his archiepiscopal dignity, but of his character as a master in literature. "And now," he continued, "that I have paid its due to honour, do thou the same to justice, and prostrate thyself, after the manner of all archbishops, before the feet of the vicar of St. Peter." Lanfranc hesitated not to comply;—and Alexander not only bestowed upon him the pallium, which he had come to seek, but also presented him, as a mark of his private friendship, with another vestment of the same kind, in which he had been accustomed himself to officiate at the holy Eucharist. And, as some question arose with respect to the validity of the consecration of Thomas of York, as well as of Remigius of Lincoln, by whom the English metropolitans had been accompanied on their journey, the pontiff, as the highest possible compliment to the favoured Lanfranc, placed the destiny of his companions in his hands. From him they received again the rings and staves which



they had surrendered; and then returned in his company to their native country.

The reader will here see the craft and flattery to which the Popes of Rome would stoop in order to gain a point. The unjustifiable submission of Lanfranc to the Roman See established a precedent not forgotten at Rome. But notwithstanding the zeal for Romanism displayed by Lanfranc, Alexander II. was too wily a pontiff to disoblige the King of England, or Thomas of York, by undertaking to decide the disputed right of precedence. This he thought ought to be determined by a synod of the Church of England.

In 1071, Archbishop Lanfranc held a council at Winchester. Sixteen canons were published, the heads of which only remain to us.

1. That no one be allowed to preside over two bishoprics.

2. That no one be ordained by means of simoniacal heresy.

3. That foreign clergymen be not received without letters commendatory.

4. That ordinations be performed at the certain seasons.

5. Of altars, that they be of stone.

6. That the sacrifice be not of beer, or water alone, but of wines mixed with water only.

7. Of baptism, that it be celebrated at Easter or Whitsuntide only, except there be danger of death.

8. That masses be not celebrated in churches before they have been consecrated.

9. That the corpses of the dead be not buried in churches.

10. That the bells be not tolled at celebrating in the time of the Secret (*Secretum Missæ*.)

11. That bishops only give penance for gross sins.

12. That monks who have thrown off their habit, be

admitted neither into the army, nor into any convent or clerks, but be esteemed excommunicated.

13. That every bishop celebrate a synod once a year.

14. That tithes be paid by all.

15. That clergymen observe continence, or desist from their office.

16. That chalices be not of wax or wood.

It was probably resolved in this council that an institution of penance for the soldiers of William of Normandy, left by the legate Hermenfride, should be executed. It is in thirteen heads.

A meeting was again convoked at Winchester by King William, in 1072, at which Hubert, the Roman legate, was present. Here the dispute between the Archbishop of Canterbury and York was fully examined, and it was established from ecclesiastical history and popular tradition, that, from the time of Augustine till within the last one hundred and fifty years, the primacy of the see of Canterbury over the whole of Great Britain had been recognized; that the Archbishop of Canterbury often held ordinations and synods in the very city of York itself. At the following Whitsuntide it was also determined in a synod held at Windsor, that the see of York was subject to that of Canterbury.

In 1075, Lanfranc presided over another synod, in the Church of St. Paul, London. Nine fresh canons were published, and many of those enacted on former councils, renewed.

1. Ordains, in accordance with the decree of Milevi, Braga, and the fourth of Toledo (A. D. 633,) that Bishops shall take precedence according to the date of their consecration, unless privilege of precedence belongs to their sees by ancient custom. It was also decreed that the Archbishop of York should sit on the Archbishop of Canterbury's right hand, the Bishop of London on his left; Winchester next to York, but if the Archbishop of York

were absent, London should take his place, and the Bishop of Winchester sit on the Archbishop of Canterbury's left.

2. Orders monks to observe their order, according to the rule of St. Benedict and the dialogue of St. Gregory; forbids them, under heavy penalties, to have any thing of their own.

3. By royal favour, and the authority of the synod, leave was granted to three bishops to remove from villages to cities, viz., Herman from Sherbourn to Salisbury, Stigand from Selsea to Chichester, and Peter from Lichfield to Chester.

4. Orders that no one shall ordain or receive a clerk or monk not belonging to him, without letters commendatory.

5. Permits no one, except the bishops and abbots, to speak in council without the licence of the metropolitan.

6. Forbids to marry any one of kin, or any of the kindred of a deceased wife.

7. Forbids simony.

8. Forbids to hang up the bones of dead animals to drive away pestilence from cattle, forbids sorcery, divinations, and other works of the devil.

9. Forbids any bishop, abbot, or clergyman to sit as judge in a cause implicating the life or limbs of the accused.

In 1076, Archbishop Lanfranc held another council, at Winchester, at which six canons were published.

1. Forbids canons to have wives. Enacts that such priests as live in castles and villages, be not forced to dismiss their wives if they have them. Forbids such as have no wives to marry, and bishops to ordain in future any who do not declare that they have no wife.

2. Forbids to receive a clerk or monk without letters from his bishop.



3. Forbids the clergy to pay any service for his benefice but what he paid in the time of King Edward.

4. Laymen accused of any crime, to be excommunicated after the third summons to appear before the bishop, if they refuse.

5. Declares a marriage made without the priest's benediction, to be a state of fornication.

6. Forbids all supplantation of churches.

In the year 1073, Pope Alexander II. died, and was succeeded by Hildebrand, (*see his Life,*) under the title of Gregory VII. Gregory dispatched his legate Hubert, to England, in prosecution of his design of establishing a spiritual empire at Rome, to assert his title to the kingdom of England, and demand an oath of fealty from King William, together with the immediate payment of all the arrears of Peter-pence, which he affected to call a tribute. But William (though he had always professed great veneration for the bishops of Rome, by whom he had been countenanced in his attempt on England,) rejected the demand of homage with becoming indignation, and only promised to send Peter-pence as a free gift, in imitation of his predecessors. Still further to mortify the pride and resist the pretensions of the pope, he would not permit Lanfranc to leave the kingdom, though that pontiff had sent him several letters commanding him to come to Rome. These affronts wrought up the rage of Gregory to so high a pitch, that, in a letter to his legate Hubert, A.D. 1078, he gave William the most opprobrious names, and threatened to make him feel the resentment of St. Peter. But St. Peter was either not so vindictive as his successor Gregory, or King William was beyond the reach of his resentment.

A considerable change was introduced into the creed of the Church of England under the primacy, and chiefly by the means, of Archbishop Lanfranc. The present doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the

corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament, called Transubstantiation, was little known, and less regarded, in this island before the Norman conquest. But Lanfranc was one of the most zealous champions for that doctrine, of the age in which he flourished, and disputed, wrote, and preached in its defence, both before and after his elevation to the see of Canterbury. This elevation, however, it is highly probable, gave additional weight to his arguments, and enabled him to make many proselytes.

William the Conqueror exercised his supremacy over the Church of England with a high hand, and made some important changes both in the state of its revenues and of its policy. Finding the English clergy and monasteries possessed of far too great a proportion of the riches of the kingdom, he stript them of many of their estates by various means, and subjected those they still retained to the same military services, and feudal prestations of all kinds, with the lands of the laity. A reasonable regulation, that those who enjoyed so large a share of the wealth, should contribute in the same proportion with others to the defence and support of the state. So strict an eye did he keep over the clergy in the exercise of discipline, and government of the Church, that he did not allow any of them—to go out of the kingdom without his leave,—to acknowledge any pope without his direction,—to publish any letters from Rome, till he had seen and approved them,—to hold any councils, or to make any canons without his consent, or to pronounce a sentence of excommunication on any of his nobles, without his permission. But the most considerable change that this prince made in the constitution of the Church of England, was towards the conclusion of his reign, when he separated the ecclesiastical from the civil courts, which in the Anglo-Saxon times had been united,—a change that was

attended with very important consequences both to Church and State.

Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, died May 28th, A.D. 1089, having survived his royal friend and patron, William the Conqueror, about one year and eight months. This prelate is celebrated by our ancient historians for his wisdom, learning, munificence, and other virtues. His charity in particular is said to have been so great, that he bestowed in that way no less than five hundred pounds a year. A prodigious sum in those times, equal in weight to £1,500 of our money, and in value to at least £7,500. This is a sufficient proof of the great revenues of the see of Canterbury at that period, as well as of the great generosity of this prelate.

He also acquired a high reputation by his writings, which consist of:—Commentaries upon the Epistles of St. Paul; a Commentary upon the Psalms; a Treatise concerning Confession; a Dissertation concerning the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, in opposition to Berenger; and a Collection of Letters. His works were collected together, and published, for the first time, in 1648, fol., and illustrated with valuable notes, by Lucas d'Archery, a Benedictine of the congregation of St. Maur. Lanfranc rebuilt the Cathedral of Canterbury.—*Collier. Henry. William of Malmsbury. Johnson's Eccles. Laws. Wilkin's Conc. Bowden's Life of Gregory VII. Mohler's St. Anselm.*

#### LANG, JOHN MICHAEL.

JOHN MICHAEL LANG was born at Ezelwangen, in the duchy of Sultzbach, in 1664. He became professor of theology at Altorf, from whence he removed, in 1710,



to Prentzlow, where he died, in 1731. His works are—1. *Philologia Barbaro-Græca*, 4to. 2. *Dissertationes Botanico-Theologicæ*, 4to. 3. *De Fabulis Mohammedicis*, 4to.—*Moreri*.

LANGBAINE, GERARD.

GERARD LANGBAINE was born at Bartonkirke, in Westmoreland, about 1608. He became a servitor in Queen's College, Oxford, where he proceeded to the degree of D.D., in 1646. He was at this time keeper of the archives, and provost of his college, which places he held till his death, in 1658. Although he retained his places under the usurpation, he retained also his principles, conducting himself, however, with much worldly discretion. He endowed a free-school of his native place, and published:—1. An edition of Longinus, 8vo., which was published in 1636, and established his character as a scholar. This was followed by several other publications, namely:—A Brief Discourse relating to the Times of Edward VI.; or the State of the Times as they stood in the reign of Edward VI.; by way of preface to a book, entitled, *The true Subject to the Rebel; or, the Hurt of Sedition, &c.*, written by Sir John Cheke. To this he prefixed, *The Life of Sir John Cheke. Episcopal Inheritance, or a Reply to the humble Examination of a printed Abstract; or, the Answers to Nine Reasons of the House of Commons against the Votes of Bishops in Parliament: to this is added, A Determination of the late learned Bishop of Salisbury, (Davenant) Englished. A Review of the Covenant; wherein the original, grounds, means, matter, and ends of it are examined, and out of the principles of the remonstrances, declarations, votes, orders, and ordinances of the prime covenanters, or*

the firmer grounds of Scripture, law, and reason, disproved. Answer of the Chancellor Master and Scholars of the University of Oxford, to the Petition, Articles of Grievance, and Reasons of the City of Oxford, presented to the committee for regulating the University of Oxford. Quæstiones pro More solenni in Vesperis propositæ A.D. 1651. Platonicorum aliquot, qui etiamnum supersunt, Authorum Græcorum, imprimis, mox et Latinorum, Syllabus alphabeticus, drawn up at the desire of Archbishop Usher, but left imperfect. There is also ascribed to Dr. Langbaine, A View of the New Directory; and a Vindication of the ancient Liturgy of the Church of England: in answer to the reasons pretended in the ordinance and preface for abolishing the one, and establishing the other, Oxford, 1645, 4to. He also published:—The Foundation of the University of Oxford; with a catalogue of the principal founders and special benefactors of all the colleges, and total number of the students, mostly taken from the tables of John Scot of Cambridge; The Foundation of the University of Cambridge, with a catalogue. He likewise laboured very much in finishing Archbishop Usher's *Chronologia Sacra*: this was completed by Barlow. He translated into Latin, Reasons of the present Judgment of the university concerning the solemn League and Covenant; and he assisted Dr. Robert Sanderson and Dr. Richard Zouch in the drawing up of those reasons. He translated into English, A Review of the Council of Trent; written in French by Chemnitz, Oxford, 1638, fol., in which is represented the dissent of the Gallican Church from several conclusions of the council. In Parr's collection of Archbishop Usher's Letters are several of Langbaine's addressed to that prelate.—*Wood. Gen. Dict. Usher's Life.*

## LANGHAM, SIMON DE.

SIMON DE LANGHAM was born at Langham, in Rutlandshire. The date of his birth is unknown, but he became a monk of St. Peter, Westminster, or Westminster Abbey, in 1335, and as such he officiated, in 1346, at the Triennial Chapter of the Benedictines, held at Northampton. In 1349, he was elected prior, and within two months he succeeded to the post of abbot, the office being vacant by the death of Simon de Byrcheston, who, with twenty-six of the monks, died of the plague.

As Abbot of Westminster he attended the great council which was convened by Edward III., to resist, among other things, the usurpations of the Pope of Rome upon the Church of England. The king, "by the advice of his lords, and with the consent of some bishops, took possession of all the revenues in England, enjoyed by alien cardinals, and other foreign ecclesiastics, especially these of the French nation." It was monstrous, indeed, for non-resident foreigners to derive their incomes from the Church of England, and through the intrigues and false pretensions of popes to be glutted with sinecures.

As Edward III. was employed in reforming the Church, so did Langham undertake the reformation of his abbey. Simon de Byrcheston had been a voluptuary, and had surrounded himself by luxurious monks, who had wasted the property of the chapter. Langham, by a prudent economy, was soon able to pay off the debts incurred by his two immediate predecessors, amounting to 2,400 marks.

Flete, in his "History of Westminster Abbey," informs us "that the abbot purchased the place of Sergeant of the Cellar, which was to become a thing of inheritance to the brotherhood, for the purpose of being gratuitously disposed of for the future." He likewise presented to



the convent, from his own portion, a garden, somewhere within the close, called the Bourgoigne. There were formerly other parts of Westminster which had foreign names, such as Petty Calais, Petty France; appellations said to be derived from the staple merchants of Calais, and the woolstaplers who dwelt in those places.

The abilities and integrity of Simon de Langham did not long escape the observation of King Edward, who, in March, 1360, promoted him to the place of Lord Treasurer, one of the highest offices in the state. The ancient salary annexed to the post of Lord-treasurer was £383 per annum. His conduct in this high office belongs to the department of the civil statesman. The monkish writers report of him gratefully, that he obtained for his abbey two bucks yearly from Windsor Forest, in addition to the eight bucks given by Henry III. When money was scarce, and rent was for the most part paid in kind, the present was not a mere luxury, it was an addition to the wealth of the monastery. We are further informed, that he obtained in 1355, the head of St. Benedict, as a present from the king to his abbey; and in 1362, he obtained for the society the gift of the sacred vestments in which St. Peter used to officiate!

In the year 1361, Langham was elected to the see of London, but Ely being offered to him at the same time, or soon after, he chose the latter diocese, and was consecrated March 20, 1361-2. He probably chose Ely, not only because the revenue annexed to it was larger, but because it afforded him more time for those secular pursuits for which the higher clergy in the middle ages did not hesitate to neglect the duties of their sacred office. His duties as a minister of the state were performed so much to the satisfaction of the king, that on the 19th of February, 1363-4, he was removed from the post of Lord-treasurer to that of Lord-chancellor;

and in July, 1366, he was translated to the see of Canterbury.

In 1367, he published some Constitutions, whether intended for the whole province, or only for his diocese, is not quite clear; the first relates to Mortuaries. In the second he says:—"We charge rectors, vicars, and other parish chaplains, firmly injoining them by the obedience which they owe us, that they by frequent exhortation earnestly persuade their parishioners, that they do not rashly violate this prohibition; or else that they denounce such as they find culpable in this respect, suspended from entrance into the church, and from participation of the Sacraments, till setting aside other penalties, they go to our Penitentiary, humbly to receive whatever he shall injoin as a penance for such transgression. When a multitude of men, exceeding ten in number, stay long together in the same house for drinking's sake, we declare these to be common drinking bouts. But we mean not to comprehend travellers and strangers, and such as meet (though in taverns) at fairs and markets, under this prohibition. Detesting these common drinking bouts, which by a change of name they call *Charity Scot-ales*, we charge that the authors of such drinking bouts, and they who publicly meet at them, be publicly, solemnly denounced excommunicate, till they have made competent satisfaction for it, and have merited the benefit of absolution.

"3. Let none presume to celebrate mass twice a day, unless on the day of the nativity or resurrection of our Lord, or when one has a corpse to bury, and that in his own church only; and then let not the celebrator drink the washings of his finger and of the cup. Let the offender know that he is suspended from his office; unless perchance he be compelled by necessity, which we think fit thus to explain and limit, namely:—If espousals are to be made on a festival that has nine lessons, or in the Lent, or in the Ember Days; on

the account of the sudden illness of a fellow-priest, or of his manifest absence in the business of the Church, or upon his own necessary occasions."

He was zealous as a reformer of abuses, especially in regard to pluralities, some ecclesiastics in these middle ages holding twenty or thirty livings without cure of souls.

He has incurred some censure by removing the celebrated John Wickliff from the headship of Canterbury Hall, at Oxford. His reason was an unjust one. With a narrow monastic spirit, he desired that the hall should be a college for the education of monks, and thought a secular priest was not a proper person to be at its head. The fellows very properly remonstrated against this act of tyranny, and the archbishop more tyrannically still, sequestered a large portion of their revenues. The fellows, according to the custom of the age, appealed to the Pope of Rome, and the Pope of Rome, ever partial to monks, decided against the fellows, and this probably first suggested to Wickliff an inquiry into papal abuses.

The Pope of Rome, desirous of bribing to the Romish cause a man so eminent as Langham, holding office under a sovereign so resolute in opposing popish usurpations as Edward III., promoted Archbishop Langham, if promotion it can be called, to the post of cardinal. By so doing, according to the law of England, and of the Church of England, the see of Canterbury became vacant. Edward was not to be trifled with. A foreign potentate had conferred an office belonging to a foreign state on one of his ministers, and he very properly ordered the temporalities of the archbishopric to be seized, the see being vacant. Archbishop Langham was too well versed in the law to dispute this legal command. He returned, therefore, to Otford, a town in the west of Kent, and lived there for several months in privacy.



At the expiration of that time he set out on his journey to join his new master, who gave him the title of St. Sixtus, and accumulating upon him pluralities and sinecures, secured him an income of £1010. As both Langham and Pope Urban had been zealous in their denunciation of pluralities, their conduct was, to say the least of it, inconsistent.

He was now engaged in secular affairs. He was employed to mediate a peace between England and France, Pope Gregory the Eleventh continuing to him the favour extended to him by Urban; and when this treaty failed he went to England, no longer Archbishop of Canterbury, and minister to his sovereign, but as a diplomatist, employed by a foreign potentate, with the sense of the French court on the negociation.

Through his mediation, peace was made betwixt the king and the Earl of Flanders, who had been at variance on account of the Earl's breaking his engagement to marry his daughter to Edmund, Earl of Cambridge, and bethrothing her to Philip, brother of Charles V. of France. In 1372, Langham went to Avignon, to visit Gregory XI., who raised him to the dignity of Cardinal-Bishop of Præneste. On the death of Wittesley, who succeeded him as Archbishop of Canterbury, the monks endeavoured to persuade the king to allow Langham to return; but the king was enraged at their insolence, and in this he was seconded by the pope, who preferred employing the cardinal at Avignon, where the affairs of the see of Rome rendered his presence necessary. From this situation, however, Langham had a strong desire to remove, and visit his native country, where he had projected some architectural plans, and meant to devote a large sum of money to the re-building of the Abbey at Westminster. With this view he procured some friends at court to solicit leave for him to return, and their applications were successful; but before he could know the issue, he died suddenly of

a paralytic stroke, July 22, 1376. His body was, according to the direction of his will, first deposited in a new-built church of the Carthusians, near the place of his decease, where it remained for three years. It was then with great state and solemnity removed to St. Benet's Chapel, in Westminster Abbey, where his tomb, with his effigy upon it, and the arms of England, the monastery of St. Peter, and the sees of Canterbury and Ely, engraved in tablets around it, still remains. By his will he bequeathed a large donation to the support of that venerable fabric.—*Moser. Flete.*

#### LANGTON, STEPHEN.

STEPHEN LANGTON was born in the latter part of the twelfth century, at Langton, near Spilsby, in Lincolnshire. His family, though not illustrious, was respectable. He was educated in the university of Paris, but of his early history we have no detailed accounts. He was distinguished as a student, both in the new philosophy of the schools, and in the exposition of Scripture. From a student he himself became a teacher, first in the liberal arts, and then in theology. He obtained a canonry in Notre Dame, and afterwards became Dean of Rheims. In the middle ages, when pluralities were common, it was not considered strange that he held also a prebend in the Church of York. His reputation was such, that Innocent III., the reigning pope, a man of learning and talent, as well as of overwhelming ambition, sent for him to Rome, where he created him Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus.

In 1205, died Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury. Then, as now, it was customary for the Chapter of Canterbury to elect the archbishop, a *congé d'elire* being first obtained from the crown, which in granting permission to the chapter to elect, was wont to recom-

mend the clerk to be elected, expecting to be obeyed. But at this time there was some dispute as to the right of election, Lanfranc, having by an act of Norman oppression, turned out the secular clergy, Saxons, and many of the married men, replaced them by monks, thus forming a new chapter. The chapter was now composed of a prior, and one hundred and fifty Benedictine monks; and a party among these, thinking by craft to steal a march upon the crown, before their late primate had been buried, held a meeting in the church in the middle of the night, and elected the sub-prior Reginald, with the usual formalities, of chanting the *Te Deum*, and placing him on the metropolitan throne. Reginald was then sent to Rome, to obtain the favour of the pope, armed with which the monks thought they would prove too strong for the king. Reginald was enjoined to secrecy until he had obtained the pope's confirmation, but his vanity overcame him, and on reaching the continent he assumed the state of the elect of Canterbury. This irritated his electors, who admitting that their conduct had been irregular, joined with the other monks in seeking the *congé d'elire*, and in electing the royal nominee, John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich, who was enthroned, and vested with the temporalities.

The dispute, as usual, gave advantage to the Pope of Rome, of which that crafty politician was not slow to avail himself. The monks had sent Reginald to the pope, that the pope might confirm his election. The king was obliged to notify to the pope that the election had been set aside, and he did so. And Innocent immediately assumed the rights and authority of a judge. As if for the very purpose of favouring the usurpations of the papacy, another controversy arose: the suffragan bishops of Canterbury claimed a right to vote in the election of their metropolitan, and they too referred to the judgment of Innocent. He had all



things now in his power. He decided that the election rested with the chapter, that Reginald's election was void, and that the election of the Bishop of Norwich was also void, on the ground that no election could legally take place, pending a suit. The see of Canterbury being now declared vacant, Innocent, without consulting the King of England, determined to appoint Langton, by an act of tyranny and oppression almost unequalled in the annals of Popery. Seven monks of Canterbury were at Rome to represent the chapter during the litigation, with respect to Reginald. The pope commanded these to proceed to the election of an archbishop, and, on the principle of the *congé d'elire*, recommended, or rather commanded, the election of Langton. They very properly asserted, that without the permission of the chapter, they could not proceed to elect; the pope arrogantly replied by asserting falsely, that his authority would supply all defects. They pleaded, that they had taken a solemn oath in the name of the Holy Trinity, before they left England, not to acknowledge any person for Archbishop of Canterbury before their return home, but him whose agents they were: the pope, presumptuously and wickedly, declared that he absolved them from their oath, and then like a tyrant, added, that if they did not immediately obey his commands, he would visit them with the highest censures of the Church. Their lives were in danger, and all but one noble and intrepid Englishman, Elias de Brantfield, yielded to the persecution, and elected Langton. Langton was consecrated by the pope himself, at Viterbo, in 1207.

The pope was alarmed as to the manner in which his most unjustifiable conduct would be received in England, and he endeavoured to cajole and flatter King John by soft words and a present of some jewellery. But John was not of a temper to submit to such treatment. He wrote a spirited and angry letter

to the pope, whom he accused of injustice and presumption in raising a stranger to the highest dignity in the kingdom without his knowledge, and threatened that if he did not immediately repair the injury he had done him, he would break off all communication with Rome. And when the bull arrived in England which intimated the election and consecration of Langton, he sent two officers with a company of armed men, to Canterbury, who took possession of the monastery, banished the monks out of the kingdom, and seized their estates.

John was a tyrant, probably a madman, but he justly deserves our praise, in this transaction, for vindicating the independence of the Church of England and his royal rights against another tyrant, as wicked as himself, but his superior in intellect and temper.

Innocent, by an act of authority which was a manifest usurpation, directed the Bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester, to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict. By an interdict, all spiritual officers were suspended, and no religious rites were to be performed, except absolution to the dying, and baptism to infants. Churches were closed, and burying in consecrated ground was prohibited. Infidelity, as to the very articles of religion which were professed, must have prevailed in a court like that of Rome, when, to indulge the ambitious or malignant passions of a pontiff, such a measure could be resorted to. Here were two potentates, John and Innocent, at variance; and Innocent thought fit to damage the souls of thousands of persons, some even friendly to himself, in order to revenge his quarrel. Happily the interdict, though subjecting persons to inconvenience, was not rigidly observed. Ministerial offices were performed in some places, through the pity of the clergy; in others, by the command of the king. And the nation, rather than yield to Popish oppression, submitted to the interdict for six years. Had John himself

been a person of any moral weight, there might have been an entire separation from Rome at this time.

The pope was not to be intimidated; at the close of the year 1209, he excommunicated the king. But many of the clergy, including two bishops, considering that the pope had no authority to excommunicate the King of England, still frequented the court of John.

The pope enraged beyond all endurance, now assumed the right to depose King John. A monstrous assumption! And not only this, but knowing the ambitious nature of the King of France, he urged him to invade England. The pope, who ought to have been a messenger of peace, endeavoured to involve two nations in war, to gratify his revenge.

The conduct of King John, at this period of his history, can only be accounted for on the supposition that he was insane. Surrounded as he was by an army equal to the emergency, he all of a sudden succumbed to the papal power. He may have been influenced by a desire to spite his barons, whose fidelity he had reason to doubt; but whatever was his reason, he did an act, of which no Englishman can read, even in the present day, without feeling a glow of indignation on his cheek.

Two Knights Templars were sent over by Pandulph, the pope's legate, to propose to John a treaty of pacification, which, notwithstanding the preparation the kingdom had made, the traitor sovereign accepted. The people were prepared to defy the pope, when he dared to assume the power of deposing a King of England, but the king betrayed his people and his kingdom. Pandulph withdrew himself secretly from the French army, acting traitorously to the French King, and appeared before John. The traitor king not only granted restitution and satisfaction for whatever had been taken from the archbishop, the Chapter of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Ely, Bath, and Lincoln, who had betrayed the Church of England by siding with the



Pope of Rome, but he actually laid down his crown, sceptre, mantle, sword, and ring, the badges of his royalty, at the feet of Pandulph, designing to deliver up therewith the kingdom to the pope, to whose judgment and mercy he committed himself. Two days elapsed, some say six, before the haughty Italian restored the crown; and on restoring it, the king swore that he and his successors should hold the kingdom of England and the Lordship of Ireland of the see of Rome at the yearly tribute of a thousand marks of silver.

The transaction was in fact ridiculous, as the kingdom did not, in any such sense as was assumed, belong to John to give, though the people might fairly have considered the throne vacant, and have called to it the next heir. What were the terms offered by the pope have not transpired, but immediately after this proceeding, Innocent became the ally and supporter of John, which is the more disgraceful, as it was known that John had offered to turn Mahometan, if he could have obtained that assistance from Spain, which having received from Rome, determined him to become a slave of the pope.

Innocent immediately directed the King of France to withdraw his forces, which he reluctantly did; and he would perhaps have refused to obey if he had found employment for them elsewhere.

In the year 1213, Archbishop Langton came to England, and took possession of the see of Canterbury. His feeling of honest independence seems to have returned to him as soon as he trod his native soil.

John had pledged himself to make compensation to all parties who had suffered from his proceedings, during the interdict. But when the arrangement was to be made, the compensation he offered was grossly inadequate. The pope deserted the clergy and supported the king in what was evidently an act of dishonesty, and an evasion of his pledge. The archbishop defended the

cause of the clergy against both the king, and the pope's legate, Nicholas, whom the Pope of Rome sent to settle the affairs of the English Church, and great was the disgust he occasioned when travelling with a train of fifty knights, and a long retinue of servants, he was heard to be rebuking the monks in the morning for the luxury in which he himself indulged in the evening. The disgust was increased when he presumed to depose abbots for their misgovernment, and to fill up churches, without regard to the election of the chapters, or the wishes of patrons, preferring unworthy men, chaplains of the profligate John, and Italians of his own suite. The archbishop, in January, 1214, summoned his suffragans to meet him at Dunstable. From this place he sent two of his clerks to the legate who was at Burton-on-Trent, to announce that he had appealed to Rome, and forbade him, pending the appeal to institute clerics to vacant churches within his province, contrary to the rights and honour of the see of Canterbury. The legate paid no attention to this, but proceeded in the same iniquitous course as before, only sending Pandulph to Rome to vindicate his conduct. The archbishop acted in ignorance of his rights, by appealing at all to a prelate who was only his equal. But he did appeal, and made choice of his brother, Simon Langton, for his envoy, who stated that the legate had been bribed by the king, that he was bartering away the liberties of the Church of England, and was only careful to provide for his own family and friends. The legate on the other hand represented the most cruel and profligate as the meekest, the mildest, the most humble and moderate of princes; while the bishops of the Church of England he maligned as covetous and exacting. The archbishop ought to have known beforehand that the appeal would be decided against him and his brethren; nay, further, the pope in his arrogance ventured to insinuate that the Archbishop of Can-

terbury in his own province had exceeded his powers by relaxing the interdict in the royal chapels, and by celebrating service in the king's presence. He did not dare to *assert* that the archbishop had overstepped his authority, but gently insinuated it, and took it for granted.

It is but due to Innocent to say that he rebuked his legate for his luxury in such terms, that Nicholas thought fit to return to Rome. But this he did not do until he had, in the pope's name, relaxed the interdict, which was done on the 1st of July, 1214. The king was permitted by the pope and his legate to defraud the clergy, notwithstanding the protest of Langton and his suffragans.

Meantime Archbishop Langton had come forward as a patriot. Together with six other bishops he joined the barons, who formed the association which resisted the tyrannical proceedings of John, and ultimately obtained the Magna Charta.

It was he, who, at the meeting of the heads of the revolt at London, 25th August, 1213, suggested the demand for a renewal of the charter of Henry I., which demand was persevered in, until in 1215, Magna Charta was obtained.

It should never be forgotten that the Pope of Rome renounced these proceedings: that the Pope of Rome directed a bull, and fulminated his anathema against the Magna Charta: that the Pope of Rome, so far as in him lay, suspended Archbishop Langton for the patriotic part he bore in these transactions. The pope issued a bull, excommunicating the confederate barons, to whose patriotism we are indebted for the great Charter. Archbishop Langton, like an honest Englishman, refused to publish the excommunication, and neglected the bull.

As to his own suspension, the archbishop, through a mistaken principle, and in ignorance of his own rights, meekly submitted to it, but proceeded to Rome. The



bull of excommunication was published in England, but the patriotic barons treated it with the contempt it deserved. It excommunicated the disturbers of the peace in general, and thus they contended was not applicable to them.

At Rome, Langton, notwithstanding his suspension, sat in the Lateran Council, which was held in November, 1215, but took no part in the deliberations, or rather had no opportunity so to do, for deliberation was not needed, the council receiving the canons at the dictation of Innocent III.

The pope treated Langton as an enemy to himself; the pope made common cause with John, and assisted John in imposing most unworthy prelates on the Church of England. When the chapter of York elected Simon Langton, the archbishop's brother, to be their metropolitan, the pope aided John in putting aside the election, and in appointing Walter de Gray, though by so doing he stultified his decision with respect to the see of Canterbury. De Gray was a most rapacious and unworthy prelate.

On the death of John, the archbishop easily obtained a reversal of his suspension, and returned to England. Archbishop Langton, according to the superstition of the age, incurred a great expense by a translation of the bones of Thomas à Becket, on the 7th of July, 1220. The rite was well intended, but appears to us profane. It shews the progress of the worst features of Popery in our Church, which may also be traced in the synod, which, on the 11th of June, 1222, he held at Oxford. At this synod, fifty canons were published.

1. Excommunicates generally, all who encroach upon the rights of the Church, disturb the public peace, &c.

2. Directs that bishops shall retain about them wise and charitable almoners, and attend to the petitions of the poor; that they shall also at times themselves hear

and make confessions; that they shall reside at their cathedrals, &c. &c.

3. Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and deans, to take anything for collations or institutions to benefices.

6. Orders the celebration of the nocturnal and diurnal office, and of all the sacraments, especially those of baptism and of the altar.

7. Forbids priests to say mass more than once in the same day, except at Christmas and Easter, and when there was a corpse to be buried.

10. Orders curates to preach often, and to attend to the sick.

11. Directs that the ornaments and vessels of the church be properly kept, and that in every church there shall be a silver chalice and a clean white linen cloth for the altar; also that old corporals be burnt, &c.

12. Forbids any one to resign his benefice, retaining the vicarage, to prevent suspicion of unlawful bargain.

13. Forbids to divide benefices in order to provide for several persons.

15. Orders churches not worth more than five marks a-year, to be given to none but such as will reside and minister in them.

16. Assigns to the perpetual vicar a stipend *not less* than five marks, except in Wales, "where vicars are content with less by reason of the poverty of the churches." Orders that the diocesan shall decide whether the parson or vicar shall bear the charges of the Church.

17. Orders that in large parishes there shall be two or three priests.

18. Directs that the bishop shall make the person presented to a living, take an oath, that he has neither given or promised anything to the patron.

19. Provides that in each archdeaconry confessors shall be appointed for the rural-deans and others of the clergy who may be unwilling to confess to the bishop.

20. Takes from the rural-deans the cognizance of matrimonial causes.

21. Forbids, under anathema, to harbour thieves, &c.

22 and 23. Relate to archidiaconal visitations. Forbid those dignitaries to burden the clergy whom they visit with many horses, to invite strangers to the procurations provided for them, and to extort procurations without reasonable cause.

24. Forbids to let out to farm archdeaconries, deaneries, &c.

25. Orders the archdeacons to take care in their visitations that the canon of the mass be correct, that the priests can rightly pronounce the words of the canon and of baptism, that laymen be taught how to baptize rightly in case of necessity, and that the host, chrism, and holy oil be kept under lock and key, &c.

26. Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and their officers to pass sentence without first giving the canonical monitions.

27. Forbids to exact any fee for burials and the administration of the holy Sacraments.

30. Orders ecclesiastics to wear decent habits with close copes, to observe the tonsure, to keep their hair cut short, and to abstain from immoderate eating and drinking.

31. Forbids clergymen in holy orders publicly to keep concubines.

34. Forbids the clergy to spend their ecclesiastical revenues in building houses on lay fees for their sons, nephews, or concubines.

36. Forbids the nuns to wear veils of silk, to use pins of silver and gold, and to wear girdles worked and embroidered, and long trains.

41. Forbids to give to a person already provided with a benefice, having cure of souls, any revenue out of another church.

42 and 43. Order monks to live in common, and forbid them to receive any one into their community under eighteen years of age.



44. Orders monks to give away to the poor what remains of their repasts.

45. Forbids monks to make wills.

47. Forbids monks and canons regular to eat and drink save at the appointed hours, permits them to quench their thirst in the refectory, but not to indulge.

The heads of the canons are here given: the 6th canon has these words, "that all the Sacraments, those of baptism and the altar especially be performed with such devotion as God inspires; that the words of the canon, especially of the consecration of Christ's body, be perfectly pronounced. After the priest hath received the Lord's body and blood at the altar, let him not twice drink the wine poured into the chalice, or spilt on his fingers, though he do celebrate again the same day." On this Johnson remarks, "The priest was obliged after every mass to have wine poured into the chalice, that so the remains of the sacramental blood might be clean washed out of the chalice; and he was for the same reason to suck, or lick his fingers, lest any particles of the Sacrament should stick to them, and to drink the wine put in to wash the chalice; but he could not do this if he knew he was to celebrate a second time: for the drinking of the unconsecrated wine broke his fast, though drinking of the consecrated cup did not, and the mass was to be celebrated only by such as were fasting. This I take from Bishop Lindwood."

In the reign of Henry III. Archbishop Langton pursued the same patriotic course. Through his resolution he induced the young king to confirm the Magna Charta, and at the same time he upheld the royal prerogative against the barons, when they, by their insubordination, were setting at defiance the laws of the land. He died on the 9th of July. He was a man eminent in almost every department of learning. It is much to be desired that, by an examination of the MSS. of Archbishop Langton, of which many exist, a biography of this great

man could be composed. We have at present scarcely any means of separating his private history from those great events in which he was concerned. The only work of his which has been printed is that which has least value in the eyes of any but an antiquarian, a history of the translation of the body of Thomas à Becket. He wrote commentaries on most of the Books of Scripture, of which there are many manuscript copies in our public libraries. A history, also, of the Reign of King Richard I. is attributed to him, and Higdon professes to follow it in his account of that reign. One of the earliest miracle plays is considered to be his,—a Theological Drama, in which Truth, Justice, Mercy, and Peace, debate upon what ought to be the Fate of Adam after the Fall. It is written in Norman-French. The first division of the books of the Old and New Testament into Chapters is ascribed to this prelate.—*Wharton. Cave. Collier. Hoveden. Dicato.*

#### LARDNER, NATHANIEL.

NATHANIEL LARDNER was born at Hawkhurst, in Kent, in 1684, and educated in London, under Dr. Joshua Oldfield, a member of the Presbyterian persuasion. He then went to Utrecht, where he attended the lectures of Grævius and Burmann, and he afterwards studied at Leyden. In 1713 he was engaged as tutor to the son of lady Treby, widow of the chief justice of the common pleas, and he travelled with his pupil in France, Holland, and Belgium. In 1723 he was employed with others in a course of lectures at the Old Jewry. He did not, however, obtain a settlement among the dissenters till 1729, when he became assistant minister at Crutched Friars. He had now become so distinguished for his literary labours, that the university of Aberdeen conferred upon him the degree of D.D. He died in 1768, at Hawkhurst,

the place of his birth, where he had a small estate. The best known of his works are, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, in 5 vols., completed in 1743.—A book of great learning and research, to which the reader of these volumes is frequently referred. Lardner was a Socinian, and is a cold, dry writer. But though inclining always to the sceptical side is judicious and impartial. *Letters on the Logos*; *A Vindication of Three of our Saviour's Miracles*; this is a reply to some petulant cavils of Woolston; and, *Supplement to the Credibility of the Gospel History*. All his works were collected by Dr. Kippis, in 1788, in 11 vols. 8vo., with his life prefixed.—*Kippis*.

## LATIMER, HUGH.

HUGH LATIMER was born at Thurcaston, in the county of Leicester, most probably in the year 1480, although some persons place the date of his birth in 1470. That this last date is incorrect we are assured from his own authority; for he was but a lad when the Cornish rebels marched up in 1497, to the vicinity of the metropolis. "My father," says Latimer, in one of his sermons at court, "was a yeoman, and had no lands of his own, only he had a farm of three or four pound by year at the uttermost, and hereupon he tilled so much as kept half a dozen men. He had walk for an hundred sheep, and my mother milked thirty kine. He was able, and did find the king a harness, with himself and his horse, while he came to the place that he should receive the king's wages. I can remember that I buckled his harness when he went to Blackheath-field. He kept me to school, or else I had not been able to have preached before the king's majesty now. He married my sisters with five pound or twenty nobles a piece, so that he brought them up in godliness and



fear of God. He kept hospitality for his poor neighbours. And some alms to the poor, and all this did he of the said farm: where he that now hath it payeth sixteen pounds by the year, or more, and is not able to do anything for his prince, for himself, nor for his children, or give a cup of drink to the poor."

This statement reduces the age of Latimer considerably below the ordinary accounts; and it agrees with that of Fox, who says he was above sixty-seven years old, at the accession of Edward VI.

In another sermon preached before the same king, Latimer related some other curious circumstances respecting his early life. "Men of England in times past," says he, "when they would exercise themselves (for we must needs have some recreation, our bodies cannot endure without some exercise,) they were wont to go abroad in the fields of shooting. The art of shooting hath been in times past much esteemed in this realm; it is a gift of God that he hath given us to excel all other nations withal. It hath been God's instrument whereby He hath given us many victories against our enemies. In my time, my poor father was as diligent to teach me to shoot, as to learn me any other thing; and so I think other men did their children. He taught me to draw; how to lay my body in my bow, and not to draw with strength of arms, as other nations do, but with strength of the body. I had my bows bought me, according to my age and strength; as I increased in them, so my bows were made bigger and bigger; for men shall never shoot well, except they be brought up in it. It is a goodly art, a wholesome kind of exercise, and much commended in physic."

Though the parents of Latimer had six daughters to provide for, yet seeing in this their only son, a ready, prompt, and sharp wit, they resolved to make him a scholar. Accordingly, at the age of four years, he was

sent to the school of his native town, and from thence to Leicester, where he remained till he was fourteen, when, being deemed qualified for the university, he was entered a member of Christ's College, Cambridge. Here he studied with great diligence, and performed his academical exercises with reputation. Having completed his degrees in arts, he applied to divinity, and in due course was admitted to the order of priesthood by the Bishop of Lincoln.

While Latimer was at the university, the subject of a Reformation of the Church was warmly discussed; and there was a small party prepared to introduce into the Church of England the Protestant doctrines which had been propounded on the continent. Latimer, with the enthusiasm of his nature, vehemently opposed the innovators, and defended the Church against all assailants. In taking his degree of B.D., he directed his whole discourse with a zeal approaching to bitterness, against Philip Melancthon and his opinions. So pleased were the Heads of the Colleges with his zeal, that they appointed him to carry the cross in their public assemblies and solemn processions, an honourable office which he discharged with dignity and reverence.

To Bilney, the honour belongs of having, under God, opened the eyes of Latimer. Bilney heard Latimer deliver the discourse just mentioned, and was struck with the honesty of the speaker, and by the enthusiasm to which his own soul cordially responded. He sought an interview with Latimer at his own rooms, and solemnly intreated him to hear his confession. This was complied with, and the declaration which Bilney made of his faith, produced such an impression upon the mind of Latimer, that to use his own language, from that time forward, he began to smell the word of God, and to forsake the school doctors and such voleries."

Latimer was not a man to do things by halves. He

was now a reformer, a decided advocate for the Reformation of the Church, and preached manfully and boldly against those false doctrines and various abuses of Romanism which had crept into and polluted the Church of England. About Christmas, 1529, an Augustine friar inveighed against him, on account of some sermons recently preached by him, in which, alluding to the custom of the season, he gave the people certain cards out of the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of St. Matthew, whereupon they might not only then, but always occupy their time. For the chief triumph or trump, in the cards he limited the heart, as the principal thing that they should serve God withal; whereby he quite overthrew all hypocritical and external ceremonies, not tending to the furtherance of "God's holy word and sacraments." This kind of preaching was highly agreeable not only to the people at large, but even to the members of the university. One thing observable in Latimer, and that which furnished a complete excuse for his adopting this whimsical mode of instruction, is the use made by him of the figures and customs which he chose to illustrate his subject. Card playing at Christmas was so common that to have preached against the usage would only have created violent prejudices in the minds of the hearers. Latimer, therefore, instead of attacking the fashion, endeavoured to render it subservient to moral and religious instruction. He fixed the attention of the audience by talking to them in a style with which they were familiar, and he drew his comparisons from topics of amusement, that he might impress upon their minds a few solemn truths easy of remembrance, and most suitable to a season of mirth and festivity.

The completest justification of Latimer, however, is found in the provocation which his preaching gave to the Romish zealots; who were not so much displeased with the figurative language which he adopted as with the use that he made of it. They could not endure that the people



should be made acquainted with the gospel, and therefore one Dr. Buckingham, prior of the Black Friars, undertook to confute Latimer from the same pulpit, and in the same mode of illustration, by bringing out his Christmas dice, and casting to his audience cinque and quatre; meaning by the cinque five places in the New Testament, and the four doctors by the quatre; by which cinque quatre he would prove that it was not expedient the Scripture should be in English, lest the ignorant and vulgar sort might haply be brought to leave their vocation, or run into some inconvenience. Thus, said he, for example, the ploughman when he heareth this in the Gospel, "no man that layeth his hand on the plough, and looketh back, is meet for the kingdom of God," might, peradventure upon this, cease from his plough: likewise the baker, when he heareth "that a little leaven corrupteth a whole lump of dough," may perchance leave our bread unleavened, and so our bodies shall be unseasoned. Also the simple man, when he heareth in the Gospel, "If thine eye offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee," may make himself blind, and so the world will be full of beggars.

Latimer heard this sermon and engaged to answer the arguments, which he did from the same pulpit in the afternoon, Buckingham sitting opposite to him with his black friar's cowl about his shoulders. After discoursing of the mystical speeches and figurative phrases of Scripture, our preacher said that such metaphors were common and well understood in all languages. "As for example," observed he, looking towards the place where the prior sat, "when the painter represents a fox preaching out of a friar's cowl, no one is so weak as to take this for a real fox, but only as a figure of caution to beware of that hypocrisy, craft, and dissimulation, which lieth hid many times in these cowls." This application put Buckingham so much out of countenance, that he never ventured to encounter Latimer again: but another antagonist, about the same time, entered the lists against him with a greater display

of learning than Buckingham had shewn, and therefore more deserving of a serious reply. This was a grey friar named Venetus, a foreigner, and apparently an Italian, whose discourse, Latimer answered in a manner worthy of a scholar, and with such effect that as by his raillery he had shut up the prior in his monastery, so now by his reasoning he drove Venetus from the university. But these triumphs, if they added to the number of his admirers, increased also the malice of his enemies. The principal of these was West, Bishop of Ely, who, hearing of the fame of Latimer, came secretly and suddenly into St. Mary's Church on purpose to judge of his preaching. Latimer was then in his sermon, but paused till the bishop was seated, and then said, "It is of congruence meet that a new auditory being more honourable, requireth a new theme, being a new argument to intreat of. Therefore it behoveth me now to deviate from mine intended purpose, and somewhat to intreat of the honourable estate of a bishop. Therefore let this be the theme, '*Christus existens pontifex futurorum bonorum, &c.*'" This text, says a cotemporary, he so fruitfully handled, expounding every word, and setting forth the office of Christ so sincerely as the true and perfect pattern unto all other bishops that should succeed him in his church, that the bishop then present might well think of himself, that neither he nor any of his fellows were of that race, but rather of the fellowship of Caiaphas and Annas.

This, notwithstanding, the bishop being a very wise and politic man, after the sermon, said, "Mr. Latimer, I heartily thank you for your good sermon, assuring you that, if you will do one thing at my request, I will kneel down and kiss your foot, for the good admonition that I have received of your sermon, assuring you that I never heard mine office so well and so substantially declared before this time." "What is your lordship's pleasure that I should do for you?" quoth Latimer. "Marry," quoth the bishop, "that you will preach me

in this place one sermon against Martin Luther and his doctrine." Latimer replied, "My lord, I am not acquainted with the doctrine of Luther, nor are we permitted here to read his works; and, therefore, it were but a vain thing for me to refute his doctrine, not understanding what he hath written, nor what opinions he holdeth. Sure, I am, that I have preached before you this day on no MAN'S doctrine, but only the doctrine of God out of the Scriptures. And if Luther do none otherwise than I have done, there needeth no confutation of his doctrine. Otherwise, when I understand he doth teach against the Scripture, I will be ready with all my heart to confound his doctrine as much as lieth in me." "Well, well, Mr. Latimer," said the bishop, "I perceive that you somewhat smell of the pan: you will repent this gear one day,"—and so the bishop, never a whit amended by the sermon, practised with Latimer's foes from that day forwards to put him to silence.

But although the Bishop of Ely inhibited Latimer from preaching in any of the churches belonging to the university, or within his diocese, yet, as the monastery of Austin-friars was exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and the prior, Dr. Barnes, happened to favour the reformed doctrines, Latimer was suffered to exercise his ministry there in defiance of the interdict. This provoked the bishop and the leading men of the university to such a degree, that a catalogue of complaints was drawn up by them, and exhibited to cardinal Wolsey against Latimer as a sower of discord and false doctrine. The cardinal, who, with all his faults, was no bigot, resolved to hear what this celebrated preacher had to say for himself. Accordingly Latimer was sent for to York Place, and after waiting for some time he was called into the presence of the minister, with whom sat two doctors of Cambridge. When he entered the room, the cardinal said, "Is your name Latimer?" "Yea, forsooth," answered Latimer. "You seem," quoth the cardinal, "to



be of good years, and no babe, but one that should wisely and soberly use yourself in all your doings, And yet it is reported to me, that you are much infected with this new fantastical doctrine of Luther, and such like heretics; and that you do very much harm among the youth, and other light heads, with your doctrine." Said Latimer again, "Your Grace is misinformed; for I ought to have some more knowledge than to be so simply reported of; by reason that I have studied, in my time, both the ancient doctors of the Church, and also the school doctors." "Marry, that is well said," quoth the cardinal, "I am glad to hear that of you; and, therefore, you Mr. Doctor Capon, and you Mr. Doctor Marshall, say you somewhat to Mr. Latimer, touching some question in Duns." Whereupon Dr. Capon propounded a question to Latimer, who being then fresh of memory, and not discontinued from study, as the two doctors had been, answered very roundly; sometimes helping them to cite their own allegations rightly, when they failed themselves in doing so. The cardinal perceiving the ripe and ready answers of Latimer, said, "What mean you, my masters, to bring such a man before me into accusation? I thought he had been some light headed fellow, that never studied such kind of doctrine as the school authors are. I pray thee, Latimer, tell me the cause, why the Bishop of Ely, and others, do mislike thy preachings. Tell me the truth, and I will bear with thee upon amendment." Quoth Latimer, "Your Grace must understand, that the Bishop of Ely cannot favour me, for that not long ago I preached before him, in Cambridge, a sermon on this text, *Christus existens pontifex*, wherein I described the office of a bishop so uprightly as I might, according to the text, that never after he could abide me; but hath not only forbidden me to preach in his diocese, but also found the means to inhibit me from preaching in the university." "I pray you tell me," quoth the cardinal, "what time didst thou preach before him from that

text?" Latimer plainly and simply declared unto the cardinal the whole effect of his sermon preached before the Bishop of Ely. The cardinal, nothing at all misliking the doctrine of the word of God that Latimer had preached, said unto him, "Did you not preach any other doctrine than you have rehearsed?" "No, surely," said Latimer. And examining thoroughly with the doctors, what else would be objected against him, the cardinal said unto Latimer, "If the Bishop of Ely cannot abide such doctrine as you here repeated, you shall have my license, and shall preach it unto his beard, let him say what he will." Then, after a gentle monition given unto Latimer, the cardinal discharged him, with his license, home, to preach throughout England.

Thus, the malice of his adversaries was turned to good, for Latimer being now armed with an authority which could not be called in question, went on preaching the word of God unreservedly, to the conversion and edification of multitudes.

In the Lent of 1530, Latimer preached before Henry VIII., having been introduced to the king by Dr. William Butts, his physician. Henry was at that time in such ill humour with the pope, that he regarded a reformer with complacency. Latimer's honest, straightforward logic, added to his enthusiasm, won upon the King, who treated him with distinction. While Latimer was thus distinguished at court, Archbishop Warham convened an assembly at Lambeth, for the purpose of examining certain books written by Tyndal, Frith, and other Protestants; but the principal object of the meeting was to put down the translation of the Scriptures, as being unnecessary for Christian men, who, it was said, might profit equally well by hearing their duty from the mouth of the preacher.

As Latimer was present at this meeting, it has been inferred that he was not then satisfied with the expediency of allowing the Bible to be read in the vulgar tongue,

That conclusion, however, is not warranted by the mere circumstance of his name being inserted in the minutes, where he is only stated to have been present when those proceedings took place. The whole business was indeed nothing better than a political artifice, to furnish some pretext for the royal proclamation, which soon afterwards came out, interdicting heretical books, and including among them the translation of the New Testament.

Upon this, Latimer, who never made a compromise with his conscience, and who well knew what a deception had been practised upon the king, addressed him in a letter, which for boldness of conception, vigour of language, and sincerity of intention, was worthy of the best days of the Church. It was such as an Ambrose might have written. Its length prevents its insertion here. It is honourable to Henry to say that this powerful appeal to the royal conscience, though it did not produce the immediate effect which the writer had in view, made an impression upon the king's mind, and confirmed him in the good opinion which he had formed of the writer, who, about this time, was presented to the living of West Kington, in Wiltshire. Thither he went contrary to the wishes of his friend, Dr. Butts, who would have had him remain at court in hopes of obtaining for him higher preferment. But Latimer had no such ambition, and besides his conscience would not permit him to hold a benefice without discharging the pastoral duty in person.

Preaching was his great delight, and in the exercise of this happy faculty he met with abundant success. The light of the Gospel became diffused beyond his own parish, and the desire which the people had to hear him was so great that the mayor of Bristol sent him an invitation to preach before him and the corporation at Easter. This stirred up the malice of the Romish faction so far, that by their influence, they procured an inhibition against all preachers there who had not the bishop's license. Not content with this advantage, two bigoted priests, Powell



and Hubberdine, proceeded to asperse the private character of Latimer, but when challenged to prove their charges they were forced to acknowledge that they had no authority but hearsay information for what they had advanced. Calumniators, instead of being ashamed when convicted of falsehood, only became more malignant, and so it was in the present case ; for, finding the popularity of Latimer increased, his adversaries sent up articles of accusation against him to Stokesley, Bishop of London, who, contrary to ecclesiastical order, cited him into his court. Latimer, instead of obeying the summons, appealed to the Bishop of Salisbury, as being his ordinary ; on which Stokesley laid the matter before the Archbishop of Canterbury, who issued his citation, and appointed a commission to examine the accused.

It was now the depth of winter, and Latimer was labouring under a sharp fit of the stone and cholic, notwithstanding which he immediately hastened to London.

On the arrival of Latimer in London, he appeared before the commissioners appointed to examine him, and they immediately tendered him a set of articles for his subscription as follows :—

“ That there is a purgatory to purge the souls of the dead after this life—that the souls in purgatory are holpen with the masses, prayers, and alms of the living—that the saints do pray as mediators now for us in heaven—that they are to be honoured—that it is profitable for Christians to call upon the saints that they may pray for us unto God—that pilgrimages and oblations done to the sepulchres and reliques of saints are meritorious—that they which have vowed perpetual chastity, may not marry, nor break their vow, without the dispensation of the pope—that the keys of binding and loosing delivered to Peter do still remain with the bishops of Rome his successors, although they live wickedly, and are by no means, nor at any time committed to laymen—that men may merit at God’s hand by fasting, prayer, and other works of piety—

that they which are forbidden of the bishop to preach, as suspected persons, ought to cease until they have purged themselves—that the fast which is used in Lent, and other fasts prescribed by the canons are to be observed—that God in every one of the seven Sacraments, giveth grace to a man rightly receiving the same—that consecrations, sanctifyings, and blessings, by custom received into the Church are profitable—that it is laudable and profitable that the venerable images of the crucifix and other saints should be had in the church as a remembrance, and to the honour and worship of Jesus Christ, and His saints—that it is laudable and profitable to deck and clothe those images, and to set up burning lights before them to the honour of the said saints.”

The paper containing these propositions being tendered to Latimer, he read it over and returned it, without signing the same or saying a word; upon which the archbishop thus addressed him, “ We intend not to be hard upon you; take a copy of the articles, examine them carefully, and God grant that at our next meeting we may find each other in better temper.”

There were two more meetings, at both of which Latimer remained firm to his purpose in refusing to subscribe the articles, for which he was at first declared contumacious, and afterwards excommunicated. In order, however, to bring him to some submission, it was resolved at a subsequent convocation, to take off the sentence if he would sign two of the articles, namely, the one respecting the observance of Lent, and that concerning the crucifix, and the lawfulness of images in churches. Fox is in doubt whether Latimer submitted to this condition; and Gilpin, in his memoir of our reformer, roundly asserts that he did not recant; but the fact is put beyond all question by the minutes of the convocation, where it is recorded, that in the month of March, 1531-2, Latimer appeared, and kneeling down, craved forgiveness, acknowledging that he had erred in preaching against the afore-

said two articles. His words are : “ My lords, I do confess, that I have misordered myself very far, in that I have so presumptuously and boldly preached, reproving certain things, by which the people that were infirm hath taken occasion of ill. Wherefore I ask forgiveness of my misbehaviour. I will be glad to make amends. And I have spoken indiscreetly in vehemence of speaking, and have erred in some things, and in manner have been in a wrong way, lacking discretion in many things.” After making this confession, which amounted to any thing but an absolute retractation of opinions, he desired absolution. This, however, was deferred till the 10th of April, when he subscribed the two articles already mentioned, and a further hearing was appointed. When that day came it appeared that a new complaint had been brought against him respecting a letter which he had written to one Greenwood, of Cambridge. The result of this was another adjournment of his cause, on which he appealed to the king, whose mandate brought the vexatious business to a conclusion, and Latimer, after repeating his submission before the convocation, was restored to his functions.

This, however, was rather a mortification than a victory to the enemies of the good man, and therefore new engines were set at work by them to effect his ruin. But while these designs were carrying on, the friends of Latimer at court were not idle. These were Dr. Butts, Lord Cromwell, and above all the rest, Queen Anne Boleyn, who was much taken with the apostolic appearance of Latimer, the fervour of his zeal in preaching, and the excellence of his character. This unfortunate woman was now at the height of her influence over the capricious mind of Henry ; and being much attached to the Protestant party, she exerted all her interest in their behalf.

Two bishoprics were at this time vacant, Worcester and Salisbury, and the queen thinking that Latimer was better qualified to promote the Reformation in a public than



private capacity, recommended him to the king for the former see. Henry, who had already formed a good opinion of the man, very readily gave his consent, and the consecration was performed at Lambeth, by Archbishop Cranmer, in September, 1535.

The duties of his see he performed for three years in the most exemplary manner. Several anecdotes of his episcopate are on record which we have not space to relate. The following, however, ought not to be omitted. Latimer's plain speaking, and primitive boldness, stand in strong contrast to the time-serving of Cranmer:—In 1539, Latimer was in his place as a lord of parliament; but, soon after his arrival, he was accused before the king of having preached a seditious sermon, and that too at court. Who his accuser was we are not told; but Latimer himself, when he related the particulars in one of his discourses before Edward VI., intimated that it was a person of high rank, and little to have been suspected of such conduct. The charge being made in the presence of the bishop, the king, casting upon him a stern look, demanded, “What say you to that, sir?” “Then,” to use Latimer's own words, “I kneeled down, and turned me, first to my accuser, and required him, ‘Sir, what form of preaching would you appoint me, in preaching before a king? Would you have me preach nothing as concerning a king, in the king's sermon? Have you any commission to appoint me what I shall preach?’ Besides this I asked him divers other questions, and he would make me no answer to any of them all; he had nothing to say. Then I turned me to the king, and submitted myself to his Grace, and said, ‘I never thought myself worthy, nor I never sued to be a preacher before your Grace, but I was called to it, and would be willing, if you mislike me, to give place to my betters; for I grant there be a great many more worthy of the room than I am: and if it be your Grace's pleasure so to allow them for preachers, I could be content to bear their books after

them: but if your Grace allow me for a preacher, I would desire your Grace to give me leave to discharge my conscience; give me leave to frame my doctrine according to my audience. I had been a very dolt to have preached so at the borders of your realm, as I preach before your Grace.' ”

This noble answer struck the monarch with such force, that the severity of his countenance melted into a smile; and he dismissed the good bishop with a gracious expression of his favour, instead of sending him to the Tower as was generally expected.

Latimer had so little of the pliability of a courtier, that one new year's-day instead of carrying, according to the custom of that age, a rich gift to the king, he presented him with the New Testament, a leaf of which was doubled in at this passage, “ Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge; ” nor does it appear that even this gave any offence.

Latimer was consistent, and when the act of the Six Articles passed, with his characteristic spirit and abhorrence of duplicity, he resolved at once to make a sacrifice of his interest for the sake of a good conscience; and, therefore, as he would not be instrumental in enforcing what he disapproved, he gave up his preferment, July 11, 1539. But in this, as in all the circumstances of his life, Latimer maintained his habitual pleasantness, for when he laid aside his episcopal robes, he jumped up, and said, “ That he was now rid of a great burthen, and had never found his shoulders so light before.”

Upon his resignation of the bishopric, he retired into the country, intending to lead a quiet life, and wait the issue of the divine dispensations. Not long afterwards, however, he met with a serious accident by the falling of a tree, which bruised him so severely that he was under the necessity of repairing to London for surgical assistance. The persecution was now raging with great fury, and the emissaries of Gardiner were on the alert, in all

directions, to discover those who were suspected of controverting the Six Articles. The arrival of Latimer was known, and his conduct was closely watched in order to find some matter on which to frame an accusation. There was little difficulty in getting up a charge, where words of the most innocent import were liable to misconstruction. It was said that Latimer had expressed something in a conversation defamatory of one or more of the Six Articles, upon which he was apprehended, brought before the council, and sent to the Tower. There is no record of the examination, though there is reason to think it took place in the royal presence, which, perhaps, may account for his not being proceeded against on the capital part of the penal statute, in the web of which he was entangled.

Six years lay Latimer in the Tower, looking daily for death, and resolved to endure it in its most terrifying tortures rather than abandon, as he said, one jot of the truth of God's word. His life was spared, however, through the whole of that tempestuous reign; and immediately on the accession of Edward VI. he obtained his liberty. The prospect now began to brighten upon the Protestants, for though the king was but a child, his uncle and guardian the Earl of Hertford, afterwards Duke of Somerset, was a decided friend to the Reformation.

The parliament very readily accorded with the views of the new government, particularly in repealing the obnoxious acts that had disgraced the latter part of the preceding reign, and it redounded not a little to Latimer's honour that one of the first measures was an address, praying that he might be restored to the Bishopric of Worcester. The protector was very willing to comply with this request; but upon its being communicated to Latimer, he begged leave to decline the appointment, alleging, for his excuse, his great age, increasing infirmities, and the desire he had of leading a private life. He now accepted an invitation to reside with his friend



Cranmer, at Lambeth, where his principal business was to receive the complaints of poor people, and to redress the wrongs of the injured : so that the prime minister himself had scarcely a greater levee than Latimer, to whom the afflicted resorted for advice from every part of the kingdom.

He preached, notwithstanding his great age, twice every Sunday, and frequently before the court, where his protest against corruption, avarice, pride, impurity, and vice, as exhibited in his sermons, which we still possess, is sufficient to elevate his character in the opinion of all who reverence fearless intrepidity of conduct. Of the effects of his preaching he himself gives an instance in his last sermon at court. "I have now," said he, "preached three Lents. The first time I preached restitution, 'restitution,' quoth some, 'what should he preach of restitution? Let him preach of contrition,' quoth they, 'and let restitution alone. We can never make restitution:' then, say I, if thou wilt not make restitution thou shalt go to the devil for it. Now choose thee either restitution or else endless damnation. But now there be two manner of restitutions, secret restitution, and open restitution ; whether of both it be, so that restitution be made, it is all good enough. At my first preaching of restitution, one man took remorse of conscience, and acknowledged himself to me, that he had deceived the king, and willing he was to make restitution: and so the first Lent came to my hands, twenty pounds to be restored to the king's use. I was promised twenty pounds more the same Lent, but it could not be made, so that it came not. Well, the next Lent came three hundred and twenty pounds more. I received it myself, and paid it to the king's council. So I was asked, what he was that made this restitution? But should I have named him? Nay, they should as soon have this weason of mine. Well, now this Lent came one hundred and eighty pounds ten shillings, which I have paid and deli-

vered this present day to the king's council: and so this man hath made a godly restitution."

In July, 1553, King Edward died. The Romanizing party had now the ascendancy in the Church of England, and under Queen Mary they soon determined to take vengeance on the Reformers. Latimer was near Coventry when, at Gardiner's instigation, the privy council sent an officer with a citation for him to appear before them. John Careless, a religious weaver of that city, and himself a martyr, being informed of the arrival of the pursuivant and his errand, lost no time in communicating the intelligence to the good old man, that he might take measures for his safety. But though he had six hours during which time he could easily have eluded any search, he waited calmly the coming of the officer, to whom, on his expressing some wonder at seeing him prepared for so long a journey, he said, "My friend, you be a welcome messenger to me. And be it known unto you, and to the whole world, that I go as willingly to London, at this present, being called by my prince to render a reckoning of my doctrine, as ever I was at any place in the world. I doubt not but that God, as He hath made me worthy to preach His word before two princes, so He will enable me to witness the same unto the third, either to her comfort or discomfort eternally."

The pursuivant, having no orders to take his person, left the citation and departed. From this it is inferred by Fox, "that the council would have been glad to let him escape out of the kingdom, lest his constancy should deface them in their popery and confirm the godly in the truth." The probability is, however, that they were afraid of a commotion, knowing how greatly Latimer was held in veneration by the people for the abundance of his good deeds, as well as for his eloquence.

Let this be as it may, to London he came, and on passing through Smithfield, where heretics were commonly burnt, he said, pleasantly, "this place hath long

groaned for me." The next morning, September 13th, 1553, he appeared before the council, where he underwent an examination, or rather encountered much bitter reproach, after which he was sent to the Tower "for his seditious demeanour, there to remain a close prisoner, having attending upon him, Austin, his servant."

Latimer was no stranger to the Tower, but the treatment which he now met with, was infinitely more severe than what he had suffered during his former confinement. When the winter came on he was even kept without fire, on which he one day told the servant to inform his master that "if he did not look better after him, perchance he would deceive him." This message being delivered to the lieutenant, alarmed him so much that he hastened to know whether Latimer had used those words, and what he meant by them. "Yea, master lieutenant," replied the old man, "I so said indeed: for you look, I think, that I should burn, but except you let me have some fire, I am like to deceive your expectation, for I am like here to starve for cold."

There were in the Tower, at the same time with Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, and Bradford; who at first were all kept in separate apartments; but when the number of prisoners increased, the four confessors were placed together in one room. For this we have Latimer's own authority, in his protestation to the popish delegates at Oxford. After stating that he had read over the New Testament seven times since he was in prison, he said, "And because, peradventure, my masters might say, that I doted for age, and my wits were gone, so that my words were not to be credited; yet, behold the providence of God, which will have his truth known, did bring this to pass, that when these famous men, Mr. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Ridley, Bishop of London, that holy man, Mr. Bradford, and I, old Hugh Latimer, were imprisoned in the Tower of London for Christ's gospel preaching, and for because we would not go a massing,



every one in close prison from the other; the same Tower being full of other prisoners, that we four were thrust into one chamber, as men not to be accounted of, but God be thanked! to our great joy and comfort, there did we together read over the New Testament with great deliberation and painful study. And I assure you, as I will answer before the tribunal throne of God's majesty, we could find in the Testament of Christ's Body and Blood, none other presence, but a spiritual presence; nor that the mass was any sacrifice for sins: but in that heavenly Book it appears that the sacrifice which Christ Jesus, our Redeemer, did upon the cross, was perfect, holy, and good; that God the heavenly Father did require none other, nor that same again to be done."

Before this, a conference in writing had been carried on between Latimer and Ridley, at the desire of the latter, who wished to have his mind strengthened with proper arguments and godly resolution for the defence of the truth. "Wherefore," said he to Latimer, "I pray you good father, for that you are an old soldier, and an expert warrior, and God knoweth I am but a young soldier, and as yet of small experience in these fits; help me, I pray you, to buckle my harness." To this Latimer replied, "I begin now to smell what you mean. By travelling thus with me, you use me as Bilney once did, when he converted me, pretending as though he would be taught of me; he sought ways and means to teach me, and so do you. I thank you, therefore, most heartily: for, indeed, you administer armour unto me, whereas I was unarmed before, and unprovided, saving that I give myself to prayer for my refuge."

The two friends then interchanged their observations on the leading points of the controversy in which they were likely soon to be engaged with the men in power.

On the 10th of April, 1554, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Latimer, were conveyed as prisoners from the Tower to Windsor, and from thence

to the University of Oxford, there to dispute with Romanizing divines upon some of the chief points in debate between them and the reformers. At Oxford they were closely confined in the common prison. They were even denied the use of books, and pen and ink. They endured their cruel treatment, however, with firmness and resignation, and sought their chief consolation in prayer, in which they spent great part of every day. Latimer, in particular, would often continue kneeling so long, that he was not able to rise without assistance. When the commissioners appointed by the convocation had assembled, and matters were prepared for proceeding to business, the prisoners were sent for to St. Mary's Church, one after another. Bishop Latimer was brought in last, like a primitive martyr, in his prison attire. He had a cap upon his head, buttoned under his chin, a pair of spectacles hanging at his breast, a New Testament under his arm, and a staff in his hand. He was almost spent in pressing through the crowd; and the prolocutor, Dr. Weston, ordering a chair for him, he walked up to it, and, saying he was a very old man, sat down without any ceremony. No sooner were the articles read to him, than he denied them. Being then informed by the prolocutor that he must dispute against them on the Wednesday following, the old bishop, with as much cheerfulness as he could have shown upon the most ordinary occasion, shaking his palsied head answered with a smile, "Indeed, gentlemen, I am just as well qualified to be made governor of Calais." On the day appointed, after Cranmer and Ridley had publicly defended their opinions, amidst many insults, Latimer was brought into the schools; and having obtained the prolocutors leave to speak in English, he said, "I will just beg leave, then, sir, to protest my faith." Upon this he took a paper from his pocket and began to read his protestation. He had not proceeded many minutes when a murmur arose on every side, increasing by degrees into a

clamour. Latimer paused, then turning to the prolocutor he said, "In my time I have spoken before two kings, and have been heard for some hours together without interruption; but here I cannot be permitted at a quarter of an hour." Dr. Weston, "I have frequently heard of you before; but I think I never saw you till this occasion. I perceive that you have great wit and learning. God grant that you may make a right use of these gifts!" He then gave the paper containing his protestation to the prolocutor, who said, "Since you refuse to dispute, will you then subscribe?" Upon his answering in the negative, he was attacked by different doctors who tried in vain to engage him in a formal disputation. When the prolocutor at length dissolved the assembly, he cried out to the populace, "Here you all see the weakness of heresy against the truth; here is a man, who, adhering to his errors, hath given up the gospel, and rejected the fathers." The old bishop made no reply; but wrapping his gown about him, and taking up his New Testament and his staff, walked out as unconcerned as he came in. On the Friday following, the three bishops were brought before the commissioners at St. Mary's Church, where, after some affected exhortations to recant, the prolocutor first excommunicated, and then, condemned them. As soon as the sentence was read, Bishop Latimer, lifting up his eyes, cried out, "I thank God most heartily, that He hath prolonged my life to this end." The three bishops were then separated from each other, and carried to different places of confinement, where they lay for upwards of sixteen months; this delay was partly owing to the statutes on which they had been condemned not being then in force. In 1555, however, new laws in support of the Romish religion having been enacted, and the old sanguinary laws against heretics revived, a commission was granted from Cardinal Pole, the pope's legate in England, to the bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Bristol, empowering them to try



bishops Latimer and Ridley for heresy. These two bishops were accordingly brought before the commissioners, who having pronounced sentence against them, delivered them over to the secular arm. Their execution was fixed for the 16th of October, 1555, about a fortnight after their condemnation. The spot of ground chosen for this scene was on the north side of the city, near Baliol College. Bishop Ridley was dressed in his episcopal habit, thereby showing what they had before been; and Bishop Latimer wore his usual prison attire, by which he showed the condition to which they were now reduced. While they stood before the stake, about to prepare themselves for the fire, they were informed that they must first hear a sermon; and soon after a popish doctor ascended a pulpit prepared for that purpose, and in his discourse, from these words of St. Paul, "Though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing," he treated the two prelates with great inhumanity, aspersing their characters and tenets. Both Ridley and Latimer were desirous of saying something in defence of themselves, but they were not permitted to do so. They were then fastened to the stake with an iron chain. The officers next brought a faggot ready kindled, and laid it at Ridley's feet; to whom Latimer said, "Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man. We shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England, as I trust shall never be put out." A bag of gunpowder was fastened about his body, and the explosion killed him instantly.

Latimer's sermons appear to have been printed separately at first; but a collection was published in 1549, 8vo; and a larger one in 1570, by Augustus Bernhere, a Swiss, and dedicated by him to Catharine, duchess of Suffolk. The volumes consists of forty sermons, and has since been frequently reprinted. Several of his letters are preserved in Fox's Acts and Monuments; among which is his celebrated one to king Henry VIII.

in 1530, for restoring again the free liberty of reading the holy Scriptures. Injunctions given by him to the prior and convent of St. Mary House in Worcester, during his first visitation in 1537, are also inserted in the collection of records, at the end of the second volume of Burnet's History of the Reformation.—*Watkins. Gilpin. Foxe. Burnet. Collier.*

## LATOMUS, JAMES.

JAMES LATOMUS was born at Cambron, in Hainault, and became a doctor and professor of divinity in the University of Louvain, and is classed by the Romanists amongst the ablest opponents of Luther. He also wrote A Dialogue concerning the three Languages, or the Study of Theology; in which he endeavours to defend scholastic divinity, and, without naming Erasmus, to refute many things in his Treatise on the Study of Divinity. That writer was not slow in replying to Latomus, who endeavoured to refute him in an Apology. All Latomus's works were published in 1550, fol. He died in 1554. Luther's refutation of Latomus's defence of the Articles of Louvain is accounted one of the ablest works of that great reformer.—*Du Pin. Moreri.*

## LAUD, WILLIAM.

WILLIAM LAUD, the son of a clothier at Reading, was born October 7th, 1573, and was educated at the Free School there. Upon removing to St. John's College, in Oxford, he became a scholar of that house in 1590, and a fellow in 1593. He took the degree of B.A. in 1594, and that of M.A. in 1598. He was this year chosen Grammar Lecturer; and being ordained priest in 1601, read, the following year, a divinity lecture in his college. It was either in this or in some other academical exercises

performed about the same time, that Laud first came forward in vindication of the articles and constitution of the Church. Contrary to the prevalent system, Laud had prosecuted his theological studies in the spirit of the canon of 1671, which enjoins that the interpretation of Scripture should be regulated, not by a licentious exercise of private judgment, but by a strict regard to the doctrines of the primitive fathers of the Church. It was remarked by Bishop Young, who ordained him, that his studies had not been confined to the narrow and partial systems of Geneva; but that his scheme of divinity had been raised "upon the noble foundation of the fathers, the councils, and the ecclesiastical historians."

But a great change and reaction had taken place in Oxford. Fifty years before, almost all the heads of houses had been of the Romish party in the Church of England, and had burned the reformers: now the reverend heads and the professors had rushed to the opposite extreme, and maintained the doctrines of Geneva. The dark theory of Calvinistic predestination was maintained as an essential ingredient in the faith of a Christian man. The authority of the Church was scornfully disregarded, and the very existence of a visible Church, during the period of papal predominance was gravely questioned by men of note. The fashion was to identify the English Church with the foreign reformation; and, contrary to the fact, to induce young men to suppose not that the old Catholic Church of England had been, forty or fifty years before, reformed, but that an entirely new sect had been established.

If we hold that ours is the old Church reformed, and that we retain the apostolical succession, we must, of course, admit the Roman Church to have been a true though a corrupt Church, at least till the Council of Trent: and Laud at this period maintained the constant and perpetual visibility of the Church of Christ, descended from the Apostles to the Church of Rome, and



continued in that Church, as in others of the East and West, until the Reformation.

From this time he incurred the deadly hatred of the Ultra-protestants, both in and out of the Church. The leader of that party was Dr. George Abbot, Master of University College, who afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury. He did not go so far as to say that the visible Church ever ceased to exist, but he preferred to seek it rather among the conventicles of the Albigenses, the Berengarians, Wickliffites, and Hussites, than in the Catholic Churches directly or indirectly connected with Rome. The head of a house resented the impertinence of a master of arts who dared to think differently from himself, and Abbot never forgave this act of open resistance to the authority of his name. From this moment to the end of his days Laud was detested and persecuted by the party of Abbot as a confederate of popery and a sworn enemy of the Gospel of Christ. His good deeds were ascribed to wrong motives, and things laid to his charge that he knew not. Alas! that Christians should so forget the spirit and principles of Christianity!

But Laud was not the man to be daunted by persecution. He had the truth, and he intended to abide by it. And consequently in his exercise for his B.D. degree, in 1604, he maintained first, the necessity of baptism; and, secondly, that there could be no true Church without diocesan bishops. He again provoked the wrath of the heads of houses, but that his opinions commended themselves to the judgment of the graver and more learned members of the university may be inferred by his having been elected Proctor of the University, without any canvas on his part.

In 1603, Laud had been appointed chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire, and in 1605 he consented to marry the Earl to the Lady Penelope Devereux, daughter of the Earl of Essex. On account of a criminal intercourse

with the Earl, the lady had been divorced from her husband, Lord Rich. The Earl was desirous of repairing by marriage, the injury he had inflicted on her reputation. The legal principles applicable to such a case were at that time more unsettled than they now are, though Laud must have been aware that he was acting illegally, when he performed the marriage ceremony. He must at the same time have known that he would mar all his worldly prospects of preferment. But the relation between a peer and his chaplain was in those days much closer than it is now, and the affectionate and grateful feelings predominated in the character of Laud. He was a true friend wherever he gave his friendship. He consented; and of course he was exposed to the deserved reproaches of the Ultra-Protestants, who knew not, however, that they were reproaching a poor penitent who converted St. Stephen's-day, on which day he performed the solemnity, into an annual fast, and used the following prayer composed by himself:—"Behold Thy servant, O my God, and in the bowels of Thy mercy have compassion on me. Behold, I am become a reproach to Thy holy name, by serving my ambition, and the sins of others; which, though I did it by the persuasion of other men, yet my own conscience did check and upbraid me in it. Lord, I beseech Thee, for the mercies of Jesus Christ, enter not into judgment with me, Thy servant, but hear His blood, imploring mercies for me. Neither let this marriage prove a divorcing of my soul from Thy grace and favour. For much more happy had I been, if, being mindful of this day, I had suffered martyrdom, as did St. Stephen, the first of martyrs, denying that which either my less faithful friends, or less godly friends, had pressed upon me. I promised myself that the darkness would hide me. But that hope soon vanished away. Nor doth the light appear more plainly, than I, that have committed that foul offence. Even so, O Lord,

it pleased Thee, of Thine infinite mercy, to deject me with this heavy ignominy, that I might learn to seek Thy name. O Lord, how grievous is the remembrance of my sins to this very day, after so many and such reiterated prayers, poured out unto Thee, from a sorrowfull and afflicted spirit. Be merciful unto me. Hearken to the prayers of Thy humble and dejected servant; and raise me up again, O Lord, that I may not die in my sin, but that I may live with Thee hereafter; and, living, evermore rejoice in Thee, through the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Saviour. Amen.” —“A brave example,” exclaims Heylyn, “of a penitent and afflicted soul; which many of us may admire, but few will imitate.”

Laud's first preferment was the vicarage of Stanford, in Northamptonshire, in 1607; and in 1608, he obtained the advowson of North Kilworth, in Leicestershire. He was no sooner invested with these livings, than he put the parsonage houses in good repair, and gave twelve poor people a constant allowance, which was his invariable practice in all his subsequent preferments. This same year he commenced D.D., and was made chaplain to Neile, Bishop of Rochester; and preached his first sermon before king James, at Theobalds, Sept. 17, 1609. In order to be near his patron, he exchanged North Kilworth for the rectory of West Tilbury, in Essex, into which he was inducted in 1609. The following year, the bishop gave him the living of Cuckstone, in Kent, on which he resigned his fellowship, left Oxford, and settled at Cuckstone; but the unhealthiness of that place having thrown him into an ague, he exchanged it soon after for Norton, a benefice of less value, but in a better air.

In Dec. 1610, Dr. Buckeridge, president of St. John's, being promoted to the see of Rochester, Abbot, newly made Archbishop of Canterbury, who had disliked Laud's principles at Oxford, complained of him to the lord-



chancellor Ellesmere, chancellor of the university; alleging that he was cordially addicted to popery. The complaint was supposed to be made, in order to prevent his succeeding Buckeridge in the presidentship of his college; and the lord-chancellor carrying it to the king, all his credit, interest, and advancement, would probably have been destroyed thereby, had not his firm friend Bishop Neile contradicted the reports to his discredit. He was therefore elected president, May 10, 1611, though then sick in London, and unable either to make interest in person or by writing to his friends; and the king not only confirmed his election, after a hearing of three hours at Tichbourn, but as a further token of his favour, made him one of his chaplains, upon the recommendation of Bishop Neile.

The office of royal chaplain was in those days regarded as the first step to higher preferment, but Abbot, now Archbishop of Canterbury, and the head of the Ultra-Protestant or Puritan party in the Church, still interfered to prevent the advancement of Laud. It was not till he had reached his 43rd year that he was presented to the impoverished deanery of Gloucester. There was not, observes Mr. Le Bas, a Church in the kingdom which exhibited in more ample measure, the *peculiarities* of the Calvinistic discipline. Every thing was in a state of scandalous disorder. The cathedral was falling to decay: the worship was assimilated, as nearly as might be, to the service of a conventicle. So notorious, in short, were the irregularities which had long prevailed, that they had excited the attention and the displeasure of the king, and Laud departed for Gloucester, armed, not only with his own zeal and resolution, but with the strongest injunctions of his majesty to effect a searching reformation. The first measure of Laud was to assemble the chapter, to lay before them his majesty's instructions, and to procure their consent to two acts,—the one, for a speedy reparation of the fabric; the other, for removing the com-

munion table to the east of the choir, and placing it against the wall, conformably to the usage of other cathedral churches. He, further, recommended to the clergy, and to the subordinate officers of the Church, the practice of a reverent obeisance on entering the choir; a custom which, at that period, was generally observed, in the chapels of the King, and of many among the first nobility in the land. But, notwithstanding the acquiescence of the clergy, the difficulties which Laud had still to encounter were numerous and formidable. The Bishop of Gloucester, at that time, was Dr. Miles Smith, who owed his advancement to his reputation for Hebrew learning, and to his useful labours as one of the translators of the Bible. It is painful to reflect that one, who had such substantial claims to public respect, should be found in bitter opposition to the redress of the abuses which deformed his own cathedral. Such, however, was the fact: Smith, unhappily, was an inflexible Calvinist; and so fierce was his resistance to the restoration of order, that, when he heard of the directions, given by Laud, for the removal of the communion-table, he vowed that, if the dean should persist in these *innovations*, he would never more enter the walls of the church. And to this resolution, it is said, he faithfully adhered to the day of his death.

The populace was excited, the cry of No Popery was raised, and Laud was denounced at Gloucester, as he had been at Oxford, as an incorrigible papist. But by his firmness he succeeded, and before the end of the year things were done decently and in order at Gloucester.

The custom of preaching against one another had now prevailed at Oxford to such an extent that Laud, with the other clergy about the court, procured directions from the king for the better government of the university, which were virtually a condemnation of the Calvinistic tenets then prevalent. One of these directions was "that students in divinity be directed to study such books as are most agreeable to the Church of England in doctrine and

discipline, and excited to bestow their time on the Fathers and Councils, schoolmen, histories, and controversies, and not to insist too long upon compendiums and abbreviations, making them the grounds of their study in divinity." Another was "that no man, either in pulpit or schools, be suffered to maintain dogmatically any point of doctrine that is not allowed by the Church of England."

These were dispatched on the 18th of January, 1616, and they were certainly an unjust interference with the rights of the university, however wise the directions in themselves might be. But Laud's great fault was, too high an opinion of the royal prerogative, and an attempt to force truth by its exercise. It must be remembered, that the Reformation was not of many years standing at this time; that a debate had all along been going on, whether the Reformation ought not to be carried further, and that a sectarian attachment to the Church of England, such as exists among some of the modern Puritans, was not to be found among the Puritans of that day.

In 1617, King James visited Scotland, and Laud as his chaplain accompanied him. Protestantism had been established in Scotland by bloodshed, violence, and rapine, and the Catholic Church had been entirely overthrown. Bad as had been the moral state of the country in the later days of Catholicism, and amply as the Church of Scotland needed reform, things were worse after the ascendancy of Protestantism, and a more lamentable state of things can scarcely be imagined, when religion was made the pretext for insurrection, and all the principles of Christianity were forgotten,—when Protestantism, like Mahometanism, was propagated at the point of the sword, and the pulpits, dedicated to the service of Him, Who, when reviled, reviled not again, were made to resound with evil speaking, lying, and slandering. No zeal for Protestantism ought to permit us to deny what is a fact. If we censure the spirit of the Marian per-



secution, we must censure the same spirit in the Knoxes and the Melvilles. James was well aware of the principles of the Scottish preachers, and desired to re-introduce the Catholic Church, not in its former state of corruption, but reformed after the model of the Church of England. In 1612, Episcopacy, as the first step, had been re-established. But Laud and the king knew well that Episcopacy is only one ingredient in Catholicism, and they went to Scotland with the full determination of establishing the whole Catholic system. The king had known from experience the violent temper of the Presbyterian demagogues, and ought not to have expected much; but it was natural for Laud to think that the king's determination would be sufficient. He could not but remember how the English had yielded to the sovereign will of Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and it was not likely that he should have discovered that James was less powerful than they. The Scottish expedition ended in the king's obtaining, as a concession, the five articles of Perth.—1. That the communion should be received kneeling. 2. That it should be privately administered in cases of sickness. 3. That baptism in like cases might be privately administered. 4. That the birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour, and the coming down of the Holy Ghost, should be publicly solemnized. 5. That children above eight years of age should receive Episcopal confirmation:—Articles which the Scottish Presbyterians took a perverse pleasure in violating. It was useless to provoke people by going thus far, unless the government was prepared to go further.

On returning from Scotland, Laud went to Oxford, being still president of St. John's, and he again raised against himself the cry of Popery, by erecting, to the great disgust of the Ultra-protestants, an organ in the College Chapel.

In 1620, Laud was installed a prebendary of West-

minster, and in 1621, he was consecrated Bishop of St. David's. This bishopric being very poor, the king gave him permission to hold the presidentship of St. John's, in Commendam, but Laud declined the favour, and has himself recorded the motive for his conduct: "By reason of the strictness of the statute which I will not violate, nor my oath to it, under any colour, I am resolved before my consecration, to leave it." He resigned the office on the 17th of June, 1621.

The following prayers from his private devotions will shew the feelings of Laud with respect to the Church:—  
"O Lord, we humbly beseech Thee to keep Thy Church and household continually in Thy true religion, that they which do lean only upon hope of Thy heavenly grace, may evermore be defended by Thy mighty power; and that I may humbly and faithfully serve Thee in this Thy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Gracious Father, I humbly beseech Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church, fill it with all truth, in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purge it; where it is in error, direct it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where any thing is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is in want, furnish it; where it is divided and rent asunder, make up the breaches of it; O Thou Holy One of Israel. Amen.

"O merciful God, since Thou hast ordered me to live in these times, in which the rents of Thy Church are grievous, I humbly beseech Thee to guide me, that the divisions of men may not separate me either from Thee or it, that I may ever labour the preservation of truth and peace, that where for and by our sins the peace of it succeeds not, Thou wilt yet accept my will for the deed, that I may still pray, even while Thou grantest not, because I know Thou wilt grant when Thou seest it fit. In the mean time bless, I beseech Thee, this Church in which I live, that in it I may honour

and serve Thee all the days of my life, and after this be glorified by Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“O Lord, Thou hast brought a Vine out of Egypt, and planted it; thou madest room for it, and when it had taken root it filled the land. O why hast Thou broken down her hedge, that all which go by pluck off her grapes. The wild boar out of the wood rooteth it up, and the wild beasts of the field devour it. O turn Thee again, Thou God of hosts, look down from heaven, behold, and visit this Vine, and the place of the vineyard that Thy right hand hath planted, and the branch that Thou madest so strong for Thyself. Lord, hear me, for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“O Lord, except Thou buildest the house, their labour is but lost that build it: and except Thou, O Lord, keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain. It is but lost labour to rise early, and take late rest, and to eat the bread of carefulness, if Thou bless not the endeavours that seek the peace and the welfare of Thy Church. Therefore, O Lord, build Thy Church, and keep it, and take care for it, that there may not be lost labour among the builders of it. Amen.

“O Lord our God, the great, the mighty, and the terrible God; O Thou which keepest covenant and mercy, let not all the trouble seem little before Thee that hath come upon us, upon our priests, upon the houses built and dedicated to Thy Name, upon the maintenance for them that serve at Thy altar, upon our kings, state, and people, since that day of affliction. Thou art just in all that is brought upon us: for Thou hast done right, but we have done wickedly. Yet, O Lord, have mercy, and turn to us again, for Jesus Christ and His mercy sake. Amen.”

We may here add from the same work, his prayers headed “Consecrationes, Ordinationes,” which shew the feeling with which he entered upon his Episcopal duties:



“O Lord, I am now at Thy altar, at Thy work; keep me that I lay not my hands suddenly upon any man, lest I be partaker of other men’s sins; but that I may keep myself pure, in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“Lord, give me grace, that as oft as they shall come in my way, I may put them in remembrance whom I have ordained, that they stir up the gift of God that is in them by the putting on of my hands, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

His private feelings as regards the Eucharist may be gathered from the devotions he used in private.

“*Quæcunque ab Infantia usque ad momentum hoc, sciens vel ignorans, intus vel extra, dormiens vel vigilans, verbis, factis vel cogitationibus, per jacula inimici ignita, per desideria cordis immunda peccavi Tibi, miserere, mei, et dimitte mihi, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.*

“Almighty God and most merciful Father, give me, I beseech Thee, that grace, that I may duly examine the inmost of my heart, and my most secret thoughts, how I stand before Thee. Lord, I confess all my sins, and my unworthiness to present myself at Thine altar. But Thou canst forgive sin, and give repentance; do both, gracious Father, and then behold I am clean to come unto Thee. Lord, make me a worthy receiver of that for which I come,—Christ, and remission of sin in Christ: and that for His own mercy sake and Thine. Amen.

“O Lord, into a clean, charitable, and thankful heart, give me grace to receive the blessed Body and Blood of Thy Son, my most blessed Saviour, that it may more perfectly cleanse me from all dregs of sin; that being made clean, it may nourish me in faith, hope, charity, and obedience, with all other fruits of spiritual life and growth in Thee; that in all the future course of my life, I may shew myself such an ingrafted member into the Body of Thy Son, that I may never be drawn to do any thing that may dishonour His Name. Grant this

O Lord, I beseech Thee, even for His merit and mercy sake. Amen.

“O Lord God, hear my prayers, I come to Thee in a stedfast faith; yet for the clearness of my faith, Lord, enlighten it; for the strength of my faith, Lord, increase it. And, behold, I quarrel not the words of Thy Son my Saviour’s blessed Institution. I know His words are no gross unnatural conceit, but they are spirit and life, and supernatural. While the world disputes, I believe. He hath promised me, if I come worthily, that I shall receive His most precious Body and Blood, with all the benefits of His Passion. If I can receive it and retain it, (Lord, make me able, make me worthy,) I know I can no more die eternally, than that Body and Blood can die, and be shed again. My Saviour is willing in this tender of them both unto me: Lord, so wash and cleanse my soul, that I may now, and at all times else, come prepared by hearty prayers and devotion, and be made worthy by Thy grace of this infinite blessing, the pledge and earnest of eternal life, in the merits of the same Jesus Christ, Who gave His Body and Blood for me. Amen,

“Almighty God, unto Whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from Whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of my heart by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that I may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“Pater de cœlis Deus, qui unigenitum tuum pro nobis ad mortem tradidisti.

“Fili Redemptor mundi Deus, qui sanguine tuo pretioso nos a peccatis abluisti.

“Spiritus Sancte Paraclete Deus, qui corda sanctorum tua gratia visitas et confirmas.

“Sacra, summa, sempiterna, beata, benedicta Trinitas; Pater bone, Fili pie, Spiritus benigne: cujus opus vita, amor gratia, contemplatio gloria: cujus majestas ineffa-

bilis, potestas incomparabilis, bonitas inæstimabilis: qui vivorum Dominus es simul et mortuorum: te adoro, te invoco, et toto cordis affectu nunc et in seculum benedico. Amen.

“O Domine Jesu, da vivis misericordian et gratiam: da tuis regimen et lucem perpetuam: da ecclesiæ tuæ veritatem et pacem; da mihi miserrimo peccatorum pœnitentiam et veniam. Amen.

“O Domine, errantes oro corrige, incredulos converte, ecclesiæ fidem auge, hæreses destrue, hostes versutos detege, violentos et impœnitentes contere, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

“Misericors Pater, pro beneficiis quæ mihi largiti sunt in terris benefactores mei, præmia æterna consequantur in cœlis. Oro etiam ut cum his pro quibus oravi, aut pro quibus orare teneor, et cum omni populo Dei, introduci mihi detur in regnum tuum, et ibi apparere in justitia, et satiari gloria, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

“O Lord, consider my complaint, for I am brought very low. O Lord, how long wilt Thou be angry with Thy servant that prayeth? O Lord, give me grace and repentance, and Thou canst not be angry with my prayer. O Lord, I am Thine, save me, and deliver me not into the will of mine enemies, especially my ghostly enemies. O Lord, I am Thy servant, Thy unprofitable, wasteful servant, yet Thy servant. O Lord, set my accounts right before Thee, and pardon all my mispending and mis-reckonings. O Lord, I am Thy son, Thy most unkind, prodigal, run-away son, yet Thy son. O Lord, though I have not retained the love and duty of a son, yet do not Thou cast off (I humbly beg it) the kindness and compassion of a Father. O Lord, in Thy grace, I return to Thee; and though I have eaten draff with all the unclean swine in the world, in my hungry absence from Thee, yet now, Lord, upon my humble return to Thee, give me I beseech Thee, the bread of life,



the Body and Blood of my Saviour, into my soul, that I may be satisfied in Thee, and never more run away from Thee, even for Jesus Christ His sake, that gave Himself for me. Amen.

“Misericors Deus, Creator omnium hominum, qui nihil odisti eorum quæ condidisti, nec vis mortem peccatoris, sed magis ut convertatur et vivat; miserere omnium Judæorum, Turcarum, Infidelium, et Hæreticorum. Aufer ab iis ignorantiam, duritiem cordis, et contemptum verbi tui: et reduc eos, misericors Domine, ad gregem tuum ut servantur inter reliquias veri Israelis, ut fiat unum ovile, et unus pastor, Jesus Christus Dominus noster, qui vivat et regnat, &c. Amen.

“Tanquam pro tribunali tuo tremendo (ubi nullus erit personarum respectus) reum memet peragens, ita hodie antequam præveniat me dies judicii mei coram sancto tuo altari prostratus, coram te et stupendis angelis tuis a propria conscientia dejectus, profero improbas et nefarias cogitationes et actiones meas. Respice, oro Domine, humilitatem meam, et remitte omnia peccata mea, quæ multiplicata sunt super capillos capitis mei. Quodnam enim est malum quod non designavi in anima mea: quin et multa et nefanda opere perpetravi. Reus enim sum, ô Domine, invidiæ, gulæ, &c. Omnes sensus meos, omnia membra mea pollui. Sed incomparabilis est multitudo viscerum tuorum, et ineffabilis misericordia bonitatis tuæ, qua peccata mea toleras. Quare, ô Rex omni admiratione major, O Domine longanimis misericordias tuas mirificato in me peccatore: potentiam benignitatis tuæ manifestato, clementissimæ propensionis tuæ virtutem exerito: et me prodigum reverentem suscipito, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

“O Lord God, how I receive the Body and Blood of my most blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, the price of my redemption, is the very wonder of my soul, yet my most firm and constant belief upon the words of my Saviour. At this time they are graciously tendered to me and my

faith: Lord, make me a worthy receiver, and be unto me as He hath said. Amen.

"Lord, I have received this Sacrament of the Body and Blood of my dear Saviour. His mercy hath given it, and my faith received it into my soul. I humbly beseech Thee speak mercy and peace unto my conscience, and enrich me with all those graces which come from that precious Body and Blood, even till I be possessed of eternal life in Christ. Amen.

"O qui sursum patri assides et hic nobiscum invisibiliter versaris, venito et sanctificato præsentia hæc dona; eos item pro quibus, et eos per quos, et ea propter quæ offeruntur. Amen."

The popular preachers of those times were accustomed not only to dwell on the Calvinistic doctrines of predestination and election, but to broach the most extravagant political theories, and to attack the royal prerogative itself. The king therefore published, in August, 1622, certain directions concerning preachers, which though framed in an impartial spirit, excited the wrath of the Ultra-protestants, both in the Church and out of it; and as Laud was supposed to be the royal adviser on the occasion, their anger was chiefly directed against him. This is another instance of too great a regard for the regale on the part of Laud. The first great reformer of the Church of England exercised the prerogative in a similar manner; both he, and the boy reformer, Edward VI., silenced some preachers, and dictated what they should say to others, and this, under the advice of the first reforming archbishop, Dr. Cranmer: Elizabeth had followed the example, but this is no excuse for Dr. Laud, who might have attempted in convocation what he did not succeed in accomplishing by an exercise of prerogative. It is only the real Bible-christian who yields to authority, merely professing Christians delight in resisting it; as is the case in our times, so was it in the times of Laud.

The unchristian conduct of the Puritans, while it inflamed the passions of political religionists, so disgusted those who looked for fruits from Christianity, different from what they now beheld, that while some were driven into infidelity, others were inclined to listen to the Romanists. The evil deeds of the Romish party in our Church were forgotten, or if remembered, were not thought worse than the spirit then displayed by the Puritans. Among those who heard them with complacency, was the mother of the favourite, the marquis, or as he was afterwards, the Duke of Buckingham. Her Romish adviser was, John Perse, a Jesuit, who usually bore the name of Fisher. This led in the early part of the year, 1622, to that conference with Fisher, under the direction of the king, in which Bishop Laud sustained the prominent part, and by which his high character as a theologian is established, this work being considered to this very day, the most powerful we possess on the Romish controversy.

It is impossible to give an abstract of Laud's admirable arguments, but the following extract will be read with interest, as descriptive of the *via media* of the Church of England :—" Let me be bold to observe to your majesty in particular, concerning your great charge in the Church of England. She is in hard condition. She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her for novelty in her doctrine. She practises Church government as it hath been in use in all ages, and all places, where the Church of Christ hath been established both in and since the days of the Apostles, and yet the separatist condemns her for anti-christianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two millstones, and unless your majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable, that while both these press hard



upon the Church of England, both of them cry out against persecution, like froward children, who scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet cry out all the while, as if they were killed. Now, to the Romanist I shall say this: The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now (many of them) very old, and when errors are grown, by age, and continuance, to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be of an older, are usually challenged for the bringers in of new opinions. And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, whether we will or not, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs, Where was your Church before Luther? for it was just there, where theirs is now: one and the same Church still, no doubt of that: one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity: their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still; but leprous with them, and cleansed with us: the same man still. And for the separatist, and him that lays his grounds for separation, or change of discipline; though all he says, or can say, be, in truth of divinity, and among learned men, little better than ridiculous; yet since those fond opinions have gained some ground among the people, to such among them as are wilfully set to follow their blind guides through thick and thin, till they fall into the ditch together, I shall say nothing. But for so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning, concerning them I shall say thus much only, they are bells of passing good metal, and tunable enough of themselves, and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is, that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are by them who have acquired power in and over their consciences. And for this there is

remedy enough, but how long there will be I know not."

"The Scripture," continues Laud, in another place, "where it is plain, should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture: yet so, as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that, upon just and farther evidence, she may not revive that which in any case hath slept by her. What success the great distemper, caused by the collision of two such factions, may have, I know not, I cannot prophesy. And though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion gather strength, while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending for it. And while they thus contend, neither party consider that they are in a way to induce upon themselves and others that contrary extreme, which they both seem to oppose and to fear. The Catholic Church of Christ is neither Rome, nor a conventicle; out of that there is no salvation, I easily confess it; but out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too. Salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave. In this discourse, I have, therefore, endeavoured to lay open those wider gates of the Catholic Church, confined to no age, time, or place, not knowing any bounds, but that faith which was once, and but once for all, delivered to the saints. And in my pursuit of this way, I have searched after, and delivered with a single heart, that truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof I have obeyed your majesty, discharged my duty, to my power, to the Church of England, given account of the hope that is in me, and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and by God's blessing and favour purpose to die."

So far as the Countess of Buckingham was concerned, the labours of Dr. Laud, and of his colleague, Dr. White, were bestowed in vain, for though they had a temporary success, she eventually relapsed into error. But the arts of Fisher had nearly proved fatal to Buckingham him-

self, and over his mind Bishop Laud from this time exerted a salutary influence. He effectually effaced his impressions in favour of the Romish creed. The entries in Laud's diary are very brief, as the diary was intended only to remind himself of facts which had occurred. His reference to his first confidential intercourse with Buckingham is as follows:—"June 9, being Whit-Sunday, my lord-marquis was pleased to enter upon a near respect to me. The particulars are not for paper. June 15, I became chaplain to my Lord of Buckingham; and June 16, being Trinity Sunday, he received the Sacrament at Greenwich." With all his faults, Buckingham had, according to Lord Clarendon, a noble, generous, and affectionate disposition, and these good qualities were brought out by Laud, while Buckingham repaid his spiritual adviser and confessor by a sincere attachment. The independent nature of their friendship may be seen from what occurred with respect to the revenues of the Charter House, in 1624.

The design of appropriating the revenues of this house to the support of the army, was opened to Laud by the duke, on the 25th of September. But in vain was it urged by the minister, that this application would both ease the subject, and aid the urgent necessities of the king. The bishop resolutely opposed the scheme, at the hazard of the favourite's resentment, and the monarch's serious displeasure. And by his faithful and intrepid bearing, he preserved for ever, to the cause of charity and literature, a noble establishment, the confiscation of which would have afforded no permanent or substantial relief to the exigencies of the crown.

We find among Laud's private devotions the following prayer for his friend:—

"Gracious Father, I humbly beseech thee, bless the Duke of Buckingham with all spiritual and temporal blessings, but especially spiritual. Make and continue him faithful to his prince, serviceable to his country,



devout in Thy truth and Church ; a most happy husband, and a blessed father ; filled with the constant love and honour of his prince, that all Thy blessings may flow upon himself and his posterity after him. Continue him a true-hearted friend to me, Thy poor servant, whom Thou hast honoured in his eyes. Make my heart religious and dutiful to Thee, and in and under Thee true, and secret, and stout, and provident in all things which he shall be pleased to commit unto me. Even so, Lord, and make him continually to serve Thee, that Thou mayest bless him, through Jesus Christ our only Lord and Saviour. Amen."

Buckingham's attachment to Laud excited the jealousy of the Lord Keeper Williams, and was probably the cause of that disagreement between these two prelates, which so much disturbed the peace of Laud's mind.

He corresponded with Buckingham, when he attended Prince Charles in his romantic expedition to Spain, having been among the few admitted to his confidence in that affair ; and he was his correspondent again when the duke was absent in France to negotiate the marriage between Charles and Henrietta Maria. The following prayer for the success of the prince in the Spanish journey is found in Laud's private devotions :—

" O most merciful God and gracious Father, the prince hath put himself to a great adventure, I humbly beseech Thee make a clear way before him : give Thine angels charge over him, be with him Thyself in mercy, power, and protection ; in every step of his journey ; in every moment of his time ; in every consultation and address for action ; till Thou bring him back with safety, honor, and contentment, to do Thee service in this place.

" Bless his most trusty and faithful servant, the Lord Duke of Buckingham, that he may be diligent in service, provident in business, wise and happy in counsels ; for the honour of Thy Name, the good of Thy Church, the preservation of the prince, the contentment of the king,

the satisfaction of the state. Preserve him, I humbly beseech Thee, from all envy that attends him ; and bless him, that his eyes may see the prince safely delivered to the king and state, and after it live long in happiness to do them and Thee service, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The prayer of Laud on Buckingham's death may here be added from the same volume :

"O merciful God, Thy judgments are often secret, always just. At this time they were temporally heavy upon the poor Duke of Buckingham, upon me, upon all that had the honour to be near him. Lord, Thou hast, I doubt not, given him rest, and light, and blessedness in Thee. Give also, I beseech Thee, comfort to his lady, bless his children, uphold his friends, forget not his servants. Lay open the bottom of all that irreligious and graceless plot that spilt his blood. Bless and preserve the king from danger, and from security in these dangerous times. And for myself, O Lord, though the sorrows of my heart are enlarged, in that Thou gavest this most honourable friend into my bosom, and hast taken him again from me, yet blessed be Thy name, O Lord, that hast given me patience. I shall now see him no more till we meet at the Resurrection : O make that joyful to us, and all thy faithful servants, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen."

At the coronation of Charles, Laud officiated as Dean of Westminster, in the room of Bishop Williams, who held that office, but was then in disgrace, and he has been charged, though unjustly, with altering the coronation oath. In 1626, he was translated from St. David's to Bath and Wells, and in 1628, to London.

The king having appointed him dean of his chapel-royal, in 1626, and taken him into the privy council in 1627, he was likewise in the commission for exercising archiepiscopal jurisdiction, during Abbot's sequestration. In the third parliament of King Charles, which met

March 17, 1627, he was voted a favourer of the Arminians, and one justly suspected to be unsound in his opinions that way; accordingly his name was inserted as such in the Commons' remonstrance; and, because he was thought to be the writer of the king's speeches, and of the Duke of Buckingham's answer to his impeachment, &c.; these suspicions so exposed him to popular rage, that his life was threatened. About the same time, he was put into an ungracious office; namely, in a commission for raising money by impositions, which the commons called excises; but it seems never to have been executed.

Amidst all these employments, his care was often exerted towards the place of his education, the University of Oxford. In order to rectify the factious and tumultuary manner of electing proctors, he fixed them to the several colleges by rotation, and caused to be put into order the jarring and imperfect statutes of that university, which had lain confused some hundreds of years. In April, 1630, he was elected their chancellor; and he made it his business, the rest of his life, to adorn the university with buildings, and to enrich it with books and MSS. In the first design he began with his own college, St. John's, where he built the inner quadrangle (except part of the south side of it, which was the old library) in a solid and elegant manner: the first stone of this design was laid in 1631. He also erected that elegant pile of building at the west-end of the divinity school, known by the name of the convocation-house below, and Selden's Library above; and gave the university, at several times, 1300 MSS. in Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, Egyptian, Ethiopian, Armenian, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Saxon, English, and Irish; an invaluable collection, procured at a prodigious expense.

After the Duke of Buckingham's murder, Laud became chief favourite to Charles I., which augmented indeed



his power and interest, but at the same time increased that envy and jealousy already too strong, which at length proved fatal to him.

Every possible falsehood was invented against him, and readily circulated; and we have ample proof that the Ultra-protestant press was as much, or nearly so, given to evil speaking, lying and slandering, in his time, as it is in ours. The exaggerations with respect to Laud's conduct in consecrating the Church of St. Catherine Cree, are such as might appear in a popular religious newspaper of the day; and the answer to the charges made against him in the matter, may be found in the fact that he made use of Bishop Andrewes' form of consecration, the form which is still the ground work of all the forms of consecration still in use.

We find the following prayer among his private devotions on laying the first stone of a chapel:—

“O Lord, merciful and gracious, this thy people are preparing to build a place for Thy service: accept, I humbly beseech Thee, their present devotion, and make them perfect both in their present and future duty; that while Thou givest them ease to honour Thee, they may with the greater alacrity go on in Thy service. And now, O Lord, I have by Thy mercy and goodness put to my hand to lay the first stone in this building; 'tis a corner-stone, make it, I beseech Thee, a happy foundation, a durable building. Let it rise up, and be made, and continue, a house of prayer and devotion through all ages; that Thy people may here be taught to believe in Jesus Christ, the true Corner-stone, upon Whom they and their souls may be built safe for ever. Grant this for the merit of the same Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour; to Whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, be ascribed all power, majesty, and dominion, this day and for ever. Amen.”

The Ultra-protestants of that day were likewise very busy in endeavouring, like the trustees of Mr. Simeon at

the present day, to obtain an undue influence over the Church. This was shewn in the feoffments for the support of lectureships. The design was to establish Puritan lectureships in the market-towns, and for this purpose certain persons erected themselves into a body corporate without the sanction of the government. Immense sums of money were subscribed, and the plan was to purchase impropriate tithes. Upon investigation, Bishop Laud found that the incumbents of the parishes from which the impropriate tithes were respectively taken, derived little or no benefit from the fund of patronage accumulated by this corporation of feoffees, or purchasers; that the lecturers, who were *hired*, not *endowed*, by that body, were persons notoriously disaffected to the discipline, if not the doctrine of the Church of England; that the preachers were left entirely at the mercy of their patrons, and were, consequently, under the necessity of suiting their doctrine to the taste of their employers; that a considerable proportion of the fund was assigned to school-masters, and to students at the university; that another part was destined, not only to the support of silenced ministers, but of their wives and children after their decease; and that all this power was assumed by men who had formed themselves into a society, without any legal authority or sanction. The conclusion from all these premises, as expressed by Laud himself, was no other than this,—that the whole scheme was a crafty device, under a glorious pretence, for the overthrow of the Church government, by placing a large portion of the clergy under a self-constituted body, in a state of dependence much more absolute than could be imposed by the king, the peers, and the hierarchy together. Under this conviction, the Bishop of London never rested till the whole affair was submitted to the notice of Noye, the attorney-general; and by him brought before the Court of Exchequer. By the judgment of that court the feoffment was overthrown in February, in 1633, and the

impropriations bought by the feoffees were confiscated to the crown. The criminal part of the charge against them was referred to the Star-chamber, but was never prosecuted further.

In 1633, Dr. Laud accompanied King Charles to Scotland. The king, like his father, was anxious to restore Catholicism to that kingdom; and, according to Lord Clarendon, if the king, during this visit, and especially after a sermon preached by Bishop Laud, which had made a great impression upon the audience, "had proposed the liturgy of the Church of England to have been received and practised by that nation, it would have been submitted to without opposition; but upon mature consideration, the king concluded that it was not a good season to promote that business."

It was indeed the misfortune of Charles on this as on other occasions, to go far enough to irritate, and yet to shrink from the last bold and decided step. Both the king and Laud were also too much inclined, like all persons of that age, to advance what they held to be the cause of truth, not so much by persuasion as by the secular arm. It had succeeded under Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and they did not observe sufficiently the change of the times. The chief lay reformers in Scotland had become zealous even to bloodshedding and rebellion for Protestantism, because they were enabled to enrich themselves by the spoils of the Church: sad complaints had been raised against them by the Protestant preachers on this point. The king had declared his desire with the restoration of Catholicism to rescue the Church property, and this, of course, made the lay reformers more fierce than ever in their Ultra-protestant prejudices. It would have been good policy to have resigned all the property, except that which belonged to the crown, and to have left the Church in poverty until re-endowed by the piety of individuals. But the nobility were exasperated, not only by this step,



but by the appointment of Archbishop Spottiswoode to the office of lord-chancellor, and of other prelates as lords of the privy council. This was a favourite plan of Laud's. He saw the clergy of Scotland especially trampled upon, and he sought to raise their dignity by conferring on them secular offices, an arrangement which excited the jealousy of the lay lords. On the retreat of the king, therefore, the Presbyterian preachers, who still delighted in sedition, regained their influence over the aristocracy, and the feelings of the Presbyterians may be best described by a Scottish writer, who says, "They considered the deepest guilt, or the highest exertions of piety, to consist in matters to the last degree trifling or absurd. Their divines gave scope to their imagination, in directing those ideal instances of godliness or iniquity. The second and fourth commandments were the favourite topics of their declamation, They could perceive idolatry in the disposition of a lady's head dress, or the adjusting of her clothes, and multiply, to an inconceivable extent, the variety of transgressions of the decalogue. The strict observance of the Sabbath they inculcated in its most gloomy austerity. To go on that day to the threshold, or to walk through one's own house if with a view to any worldly purpose or even idly, was held a deeper crime than deliberate murder."

Soon after Laud's return to England, Archbishop Abbot finished his unhappy primacy. He died 4th of August, 1633, and the first time Laud appeared at court, he was graciously accosted by the king in these words, "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury, you are welcome!"

At the time of Abbot's death, some person, now unknown, waited upon Laud with the insidious offer of a cardinal's hat; seriously averring that he had ability to give effect to the proposal. The offer, as Mr. Le Bas remarks, was evidently one, which, whether accepted or refused, would sufficiently answer the purposes of its

authors : if accepted, it would convert their formidable enemy into a firm ally ; and even if refused, it might help to ruin him, by engendering a suspicion that he was in secret correspondence with the Vatican. The offer was made on the 4th of August, and repeated on the 17th ; on both occasions Laud returned an answer, which was intended perhaps to be evasive, and yet civil, until he had ascertained the kind of formal answer that the king would require him to make : he said that " somewhat dwelt within him which would not suffer that, until Rome were other than it is." He may have regarded the offer as an advance on the part of the pope, to enter into some correspondence with the Catholic Church of England with a view of removing differences, and he may have wished to imply that such an advance would be received, though Rome must consent to reform before any accommodation could be effected. The matter was mentioned to the king, but no further proposal was made.

The policy of the new archbishop differed entirely from that of his predecessor. Abbot's maxim was, "Yield, and they will be pleased at last;" while Laud adopted the opposite aphorism, "Resolve, for there is no end of yielding." Abbot wished the Reformation to be carried further, while Laud said, "Stop, we have gone too far already." The inactivity and supineness of Abbot had already almost ruined the Church ; the new metropolitan wielded the crosier with a more vigorous grasp. He visited his province, established uniformity of discipline in the cathedral churches, enforced exact observance of the rubric, and, strictly adhering to the canon which forbids ordination without a title, cut off the supply of non-conformist ministers for public lectures and private chapels. After his example, and by his authority, the churches were repaired and beautified ; at his requisition the judges unanimously confirmed the legality of the proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts, and by his advice

the king, in defiance of every obstacle, undertook to restore St. Paul's Cathedral to its ancient splendour.

In short, we can scarcely conceive it possible for an archbishop to perform the duties of his high and difficult office in a manner more fitting, than it was discharged by the learned, the indefatigable, and the munificent Laud, whose prayer on his elevation is still preserved, —his secret prayer, which, except for the malice of his enemies, who seized his private papers when they seized his person, would never have seen the light :—

“Lord, this is the time of fear; keep Thy servant from presumptuous sins, lest they get the dominion over me : that though my sins be many and great, yet I may be innocent from the great offence, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“O Lord, make me worthy of the place to which Thou hast raised me in Thy Church, that all my endeavours may be to make truth and peace meet together. In this course give me understanding to discover my enemies, and wisdom to prevent them : a heart to love my friends, and carriage that may bind them. Lord, make me love Thy Church, and the place where Thine honour dwelleth; that as Thou hast honoured me above many others, so I may honour Thee above all, and spend whatsoever is acceptable in the poor remainder of my life to serve Thee in Thy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“O Lord, turn away mine eyes that they behold not vanity, and quicken Thou me in Thy way. Amen.

“O Domine misericors, quando a te ipse exoratus, (nec enim unquam ita vivimus, ut exorare mereamur,) pacificos nobis dies, proventus uberes, divitem bonis omnibus tranquillitatem, et abundantiam dederis super vota crescentem, ne sinas me tanta secundarum rerum prosperitate corrumpi, ne et tui penitus obliviscar et mei : sed humilitatem et gratitudinem adauge, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.”

It is pleasing to retire with a public character, and



to see something of his domestic habits, and such an insight into Laud's conduct towards his servants we may obtain from the following entry in his diary, which is, in general, a dry statement of facts, intended merely to refresh his memory. Archbishop Laud, like most persons in that age, believed that dreams were often sent by God to warn men of their duties or their dangers.

“Oct. 26, Monday. This morning, between four and five of the clock, lying at Hampton Court, I dreamed, that I was going out in haste, and that when I came into my outer chamber, there was my servant Will. Pennell, in the same riding-suit which he had on that day sevennight at Hampton-Court with me. Methought I wondered to see him, (for I left him sick at home,) and asked him how he did, and what he made there. And that he answered me, he came to receive my blessing; and with that fell on his knees. That hereupon I laid my hand on his head, and prayed over him, and therewith awaked. When I was up, I told this to them of my chamber; and added, that I should find Pennell dead or dying. My coach came; and when I came home, I found him past sense, and giving up the ghost. So my prayers (as they have frequently before) commended him to God.”

He was also at this time employed in confirming the principles of Charles Prince Elector Palatine, with respect to whom we find him writing in his Diary:—

“Nov. 30, Saint Andrew's Day, Monday. Charles Prince Elector Palatine, the king's nephew, was with me at Lambeth, and at solemn evening prayer.

“Dec. 14, Monday. Charles Prince Elector came suddenly upon me, and dined with me at Lambeth.

“Dec. 25, Christmas-day. Charles Prince Elector received the Communion with the king at Whitehall. He kneeled a little beside on his left hand. He sate before the Communion upon a stool by the wall, before

the traverse; and had another stool and a cushion before him to kneel at."

But, notwithstanding the excellence of Laud, the jealousy of the Puritans had long marked him out as an enemy: the most innocent of his actions were misrepresented to the public; and whatever he attempted was described as an additional step towards the introduction of Popery. A succession of written papers, dropped in the streets and affixed to the walls, or secretly conveyed into his house, warned him of the punishment which his apostacy deserved, and which the orthodoxy of his opponents was prepared to inflict. We may perceive how this evil-speaking, lying, and slandering, affected the archbishop, from the account which Dr. Heylyn gives of an interview with him in 1639:—"In the November of this year," says Heylyn, "I received a message from him to attend him the next day, at two in the afternoon. The key being turned which opened the way into his study, I found him sitting in a chair, with a paper in his hand, and his eyes so fixed upon the paper that he did not observe my entrance. Finding him in that posture, I thought it fit manners to retire, but the noise I made in my retreat arousing his attention, he recalled me unto him, and told me, after a short pause, that he well remembered he had sent for me, but he could not tell for his life what it was about. After which he was pleased to say (not without tears in his eyes), that he had then just received a letter, acquainting him with the apostacy of a person of quality in North Wales to the Church of Rome; that he knew these frequent conversions, tending to the increase of Popery, would be ascribed to him and his brethren the bishops, who were least guilty of the same; that, for his part, he had done his utmost, so far as was consistent with the rules of prudence and the preservation of the Church, to suppress that party, and to bring its leaders to condign punishment. To the truth whereof, lifting up his wet eyes to heaven, he took

God to witness, conjuring me, as I would answer it to God at the day of judgment, that if ever I were promoted to any of those places which he and his brethren, by reason of their great age, were not likely long to hold, I would employ the abilities which God had given me to suppress the Romish party, who, by their *open undertakings*, and *secret practices*, were likely to prove the ruin of this flourishing Church."

Of his kind manner of receiving a young clergyman deserving of his notice, we have an instance in his reception of this same Dr. Heylyn, a few years before, when he was Bishop of London.

The bishop has recorded in his Diary, (Feb. 5,) before the meeting of the parliament, as he went with the king to Hampton-Court, he strained the back sinew of his right leg, which confined him till the opening of the parliament. Heylyn was contemporary with Laud, and was intimately acquainted with him, having been born in the year 1600; and he survived the restoration, dying on the 8th of May, 1662. "During the time of the bishop's confinement," says Heylyn, "I had both the happiness of being taken into his special knowledge of me, and the opportunity of a longer conference with him than I could otherwise have expected. I went to present my service to him as he was preparing for this journey (to attend the king), and was appointed to attend him on the same day seven-night, when I might presume on his return. Coming precisely at that time, I heard of his misfortune, and that he kept himself to his chamber; but orders had been given to the servants, that if I came he should be made acquainted with it; which, being done, accordingly I was brought into his chamber, where I found him sitting in a chair, with his lame leg resting on a pillow. Commanding that no person should come to interrupt him till he called, he caused me to sit down by him, inquired first into the course of my studies, which he well approved of, exhorting me to continue in that



moderate course in which he found me. He afterwards discoursed on some affairs at Oxford, in which I was specially concerned, and told me thereupon the story of such oppositions as he had experienced in that university from Archbishop Abbot and some others ; encouraged me not to shrink, if I had already, or should hereafter, experience the same. "I was with him thus, *remotis arbitris*, about two hours. It passed towards twelve o'clock, and then he knocked for his servants to come unto him. He caused me to stay dinner with him, and used me with no small respect, which was remarked by some gentlemen ; Elphinston, one of his Majesty's cup-bearers, being one of the company who dined with him." This incident is indeed trivial in itself, but every relic of a great man is valuable, and ought to be preserved with pious care.

The internal difficulties with which Laud had to contend were those which originated in irritability of temper, and which prompted him sometimes to utter harsh speeches. That he was conscious of this infirmity, and struggled against it, is apparent from his private prayer, entitled *Linguae Frænum* :—

"Let the words of my mouth, and the meditations of my heart, be always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer. Amen.

"Lord, keep my tongue from evil, and my lips that they speak no guile ; that so I may eschew evil and do good, seek peace and ensue it. Amen.

"O Lord, give me the mouth of the righteous, that it may be exercised in wisdom, and that my tongue may be talking of judgment. Amen.

"Lord, I have said in Thy grace, I will take heed unto my ways, that I offend not in my tongue. Give me, O give me that grace, that I may take this heed, that I may keep my mouth as it were with a bridle, especially when the ungodly is in my sight, be it never so much pain or grief unto me. Hear me, and grant, even for Christ Jesus His sake. Amen.

“ Let the freewill offerings of my mouth please Thee, O Lord, and teach me Thy judgments. Amen.

“ O Lord, set a watch before my mouth, and keep the door of my lips ; and let not my heart be inclined to any thing that is evil. Amen.

“ O Lord, set a watch before my mouth, and a seal of wisdom upon my lips, that I fall not suddenly by them, and that my tongue destroy me not. Amen.”

In 1636, Archbishop Laud had the felicity of entertaining the King and Queen at Oxford, where his liberality was unbounded, and he seems thoroughly to have enjoyed himself. And here, among the happy events of his life, we may mention his success in bringing the Church of Ireland into conformity with the Church of England. Aided by Lord Strafford, that great and good man, he succeeded in obtaining from the Irish Convocation an acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles, adopted some years before in the Church of England ; and, notwithstanding the king's necessities, when the exchequer was almost empty, he obtained, from the piety of Charles, a restoration of all the Irish impropriations which had not been granted by the crown to laymen. Thus is the Irish Church under everlasting obligations to Laud ; and thus did he evince his gratitude to that Church, the university of which had elected him to be chancellor. He was not so successful in Scotland. If in Ireland he sought to confirm the Reformation, in Scotland he sought to restore Catholicism, so that the three kingdoms might present to the world three Catholic Churches reformed, governed by their own bishops, and independent of Rome. When the king left Scotland, he entertained good hopes of speedily accomplishing this object. Although he unfortunately missed the opportunity of introducing the English Prayer Book, yet he had left directions for a Scottish Service Book to be compiled : he appointed a committee of Scottish bishops for the purpose, and directed them to correspond with Laud

upon the subject. The Scottish bishops contended for a modification of the English Service Book.

They represented, that the jealousies of their nation would be in instant insurrection against a Service Book imposed by England; and that this danger might be avoided by such alterations as might give to the new Liturgy the semblance, at least, of a distinct compilation. Upon this, certain of the Scottish prelates were entrusted with the task of making a collection of Canons, out of the existing constitutions of their own Church; and of effecting the requisite changes in the English ritual. And, both Canons and Liturgy, when completed, were to be submitted to the revisal of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of Juxon and Wren, the Bishops of London and Norwich, previously to their publication. With unaccountable precipitancy, the Canons were published first; and this mode of proceeding, besides alarming the people with certain high doctrines relative to the king's prerogative and supremacy, and with the enactment of some ordinances, which were thought to savour too strongly of Popery, disgusted the people by the absurdity of enjoining a strict observance of the Liturgy, which was not yet completed, and which did not make its appearance till a considerable time afterwards. Another fatal inadvertency was, that these Canons themselves were published without the consent or advice of any convocation of the Scottish clergy, and without any communication with the Lords of the Council.

The complexion of the archbishop's thoughts, and the tenor of his actions, relative to this critical and interesting subject, may best be learned from his own History of his Troubles. That he was, himself, in correspondence with the Scottish Bishops, respecting certain projected alterations, he distinctly avows. That the intended Canons were submitted to him, for his consideration, he also confesses. Neither does he attempt to disguise that he assisted, by way of revisal, in the preparation of the



Service Book. But he positively affirms, that he never obtruded himself into these offices. On the contrary, he avers that he acted throughout under the express injunction of the king; and that, with respect to the Liturgy, he acted most reluctantly. He declares that from the beginning it was his own wish to introduce the ritual of England, without the slightest alteration. Finding, however, that this would hardly be endured, he was anxious to decline all further concern in the business: but, being commanded to take a share in the work, he gave his best attention to make it as perfect as might be. It is likewise true, that he openly glories in the design, although it was not precisely such as he could have desired, and deeply regrets its ill success. "I will never deny," he exclaims, "the joy, while I live, which I conceived of the Church of Scotland's coming nearer, both in the Canons and the Liturgy, to the Church of England. But the gross unthankfulness, both to our God, and our king, and our other many and great sins, have hindered this great blessing. And I pray God that the loss of this, which was almost effected, do not, in a short time, prove one of the greatest scourges that ever befel *this* kingdom, and *that* too." Again, "the worst thought I had of any Reformed Church in Christendom, was, to wish it like the Church of England, and so much better as it should please God to make it. And I hope that this was neither to negotiate with Rome, nor to reduce them to heresy in doctrine, nor to superstition and idolatry in worship; no, nor to tyranny in government: all which are, most wrongfully; imputed to me. And, the comparing of me to the pope himself, I could bear with more ease, had I not written more against popish superstition *than any presbyter of Scotland hath done*. And, for my part, I could be content to lay down my life to-morrow, upon condition that the Pope and Church of Rome would admit and confirm the Service Book, which hath been here so eagerly charged against me. For, were that done, it would give

a greater blow to Popery (which is the corruption of the Church of Rome), than any that hath yet been given: and that they know full well. The Reformed Churches had need look well to themselves. For, if they come out of Babel, to run down to Egypt, they'll get but little by the bargain."

"The ultimate result of that attempt," says Mr. Le Bas, "was, that episcopacy was laid in the dust; that the solemn league and covenant was substituted for the oath of allegiance, and became the guide, or the tyrant, of every conscience, throughout Scotland; and that the people ran to subscribe it, some to escape proscription, and others, as if they were writing their names in the Book of Life. It had been asserted by Prynne, in England, that Christ was a *Puritan*; and the Anti-prelatists, in Scotland, discovered that Christ was a *Covenanter*. The covenant, in short, was Christ's marriage contract. They who refused to subscribe it were no better than atheists. And, as for the prelates, the wrath of God would never leave the kingdom till they were all hanged up before the Lord! The issue of all this fanaticism was, that the power of the crown was made to bow before that dominion, in which kings and nobles were "God's silly vassals;" and the Presbyterian Kirk was raised up in such glory, that she was vaunted to be "fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners."

The times had now become threatening in England, and the difficulties [by which the archbishop was surrounded were increasing. Republicanism, the result of that resistance to authority which was one of the attendant evils of the Reformation, and of the fiery spirit of independence encouraged by the Scotch Reformers and English Puritans, was gaining ground among politicians and the republicans united themselves with the Ultra-protestant and dissenting parties, because, as Hampden said, when asked, why when liberty, property, and temporal matters were the real object, religion was pretended,

"should we not use the pretence of religion, the people would not be persuaded to assist us." Of course, the religion he meant was not the religion of the Gospel, though it has arrogated to itself that title exclusively; for the religion of the Gospel condemns "emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings," which appear to have been chief elements in the religion of the Puritans.

The Puritan martyrs, the heads of Ultra-protestantism and of dissent, are Robert Leighton, Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton. Robert Leighton was the author of "Zion's Plea against the Prelates." In this work, dedicated to the Puritans, he exhorts the godly to smite the bishops under the fifth rib, and *to slay them*; and he branded the queen as an idolatress, a Canaanite, and a daughter of Heth. Prynne spoke of the learned and munificent, as well as pious archbishop, as the "arch-agent for the devil:" he says that Beelzebub himself had been archbishop, though he does not quote his authority for the fact; he terms the bishops generally, "Luciferian lords, execrable traitors, devouring wolves."

According to Bastwick, "the prelates are invaders of the king's prerogative royal, contemnners and despisers of the Holy Scriptures, advancers of Popery, superstition, idolatry, and profaneness; also, they abuse the king's authority, to the oppression of his most loyal subjects, and therein exercise great cruelty, tyranny, and injustice; and in execution of those impious performances, they shew neither wit, honesty, nor temperance. Nor are they either servants of God, or of the king, but of the devil, being enemies of God, and the king, and of every living thing that is good." "All which," adds Whitelocke, "he (Bastwick) is ready to maintain."

"I dare boldly maintain," saith this Medico-Mastyx, "they (the bishops) are more disobedient and worse than the devils themselves, to say nothing in passion and perturbation. Of all creatures, bishops, priests, and deacons, are most wicked, ungrateful, disobedient, and



rebellious. The Lord Jesus saith, Bring those mine enemies to me hither, that I may slay them that would not that I should rule over them. If slaughter to a kingdom be the preservation of it, then the prelates are the maintainers of it, for of all creatures they are most rebellious and impious. Nay, I peremptorily affirm, that the prelates are worse than the devil." They are "rook-catchers, soul murdering hirelings, atheists, a commonwealth of rats." "The truth is," says he, "they are God's rebels, and enemies, both by the law of God and the land, to God and the king, and, like the giants of old, war against the clouds, and if to say so be a scandal, I will live and die in it." "To say nothing of the Bishop of London, who was put into his office with such supreme dignity and incomparable majesty, as he seemed a great king or mighty emperor, to be inaugurated and installed in some superlative monarchy; see the Prelate of Canterbury, in his ordinary garb, riding from Croydon to Bagshot, with forty or fifty gentlemen well mounted attending upon him, two or three coaches, with four and six horses," &c. and in this style he proceeds in his railing, till he signs himself the virtuous and elect lady's "poor orator."

Burton, in two sermons which he preached on the 5th of November, and afterwards published, assails the bishops, whom, instead of fathers, he styles *step-fathers*, caterpillars instead of pillars, whose houses are haunted, and their episcopal chairs poisoned, by the spirit that bears rule in the air. "They are," he says, "the limbs of the beast, even of Antichrist, taking his very courses to bear and beat down the Word of God, whereby men might be saved. Their fear is more towards an altar of their own invention, an image or crucifix, the sound and syllable of Jesus, than towards the Lord Christ. They are miscreants, traps and wiles of the dragon dogs; like flattering tales, new Babel-builders. Blind watchmen, dumb dogs, thieves, robbers of souls, false prophets,

ravening wolves, factors for Antichrist, Anti-christian mushrumps." He then clamours about Popery, which he flatly charges the bishops with attempting to introduce,—that the spirit of Rome breathes in them—that they wish "to wheel about to their Roman mistress,"—that they are confederated with "priests and Jesuits to rear up that religion." And, therefore, in his Apology, which, being published at his leisure, makes his sedition or treason the more notorious, they are styled "jesuited polypragmatics, and sons of Belial." Dr. White, Bishop of Ely, is charged with railing, perverting, and fighting against truth. The learned Montague, of Chichester, is "a tried champion of Rome, and devoted votary of the queen of heaven:" Wren of Norwich, meets with no quarter from this Puritan Rabshekah; and, finally, he falls upon the archbishop, upon whom he bestows plentiful abuse, and declares, "that he had a papal infallibility of spirit, whereby, as by a divine oracle, all questions in religion are finally determined." "These," says Heylyn, who quotes numerous other expressions, "are the principal flowers of rhetoric which grew in the garden of Henry Burton, sufficient, without doubt, to shew how sweet a champion he was likely to prove of the Church and Gospel."

He reproached the prelates with substituting "at" for "*in* the name of Jesus every knee shall bow," with reading the second service at the Communion table, with placing it altar-wise at the upper end of the chancel, and with having forged a new article of religion (the twenty-first), which they brought from Rome.

In the days of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, persons who ventured thus to speak of the constituted authorities, would have been put to death. Papists had, when in power, executed Protestants, and Protestants had executed Papists, and Scotch Reformers, out of power, had recommended assassination. How the Puritans and Ultra-protestants in power were to act,

their murder of Charles, and of Laud, their king, and their archbishop, would be sufficient to shew. But their principles are more strongly marked in the laws they ordained for New England. "Unfortunately," says Mr. Lawson, "the government of the mother country paid little attention to that colony, and the inhabitants made ample use of the indulgence granted them to establish any government they chose; and the settlers being generally disappointed enthusiasts, who carried with their extravagant follies the intolerance of presbytery, the phrensy of the Anabaptists, the licentiousness of the Brownists, and the fanciful notions of the Independents, who had declared the co-operation, but not the subordination, of several Churches, as set forth by Robinson, their apostle, and who were therefore not less hostile to presbytery than the latter was to them; all concentrated together in one incongruous mass. Accordingly, the administration of this colony partook of all the follies and evils incidental to prejudices and wild imaginations, accompanied, nevertheless, with severe restraint. Adultery, perjury, witchcraft, blasphemy, and filial revenge, (that is, cursing and striking parents,) were all made capital crimes. Those who were detected in falsehood, drunkenness, or *dancing*, were to receive a public castigation; but while these were strictly prohibited and punished as crimes, they contrived to sanction indulgences, and a person might indulge in swearing by paying a fine of 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per oath; break the Sabbath for £2 19s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d.; prayer might also be neglected upon the payment of a fine. They most absurdly enacted laws against the worship of images, though they were all violent zealots against popery, which was punishable by death; and the same punishment was to be awarded to Roman Catholic priests, who, being banished from the colony, should presume to return."

The Ultra-protestants within the Church were as intolerant as the dissenters. In a letter, addressed by



Archbishop Abbot, the head, it will be remembered, of what would now be styled the Evangelical party, to King James.—“I have been too long silent,” says the primate, “and am afraid, by my silence, I have neglected the duty of the place it hath pleased God to call me unto, and your majesty to place me in. Your majesty hath propounded a toleration of religion; I beseech you to take into your consideration what your act is, and what the consequence may be; by your act you labour to set up the most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome, the whore of Babylon! And hereunto I add, what you have done, in sending the prince into Spain, without consent of your council, the privity and approbation of your people: and although you have a charge and interest in the prince, as son of your flesh, yet have the people a greater, as son of this kingdom, upon whom, next after your majesty, are their eyes fixed, and welfare depends, and so tenderly is his going apprehended, as, believe it, however his return may be safe, yet the drawers of him into this action, so dangerous to himself, so desperate to the kingdom, *will not pass away unquestioned, unpunished*. What dreadful consequences these things may draw afterwards, I beseech your majesty to consider; and, above all, lest by this toleration, and discountenancing of the true profession of the Gospel, wherewith God hath blessed us, and this kingdom hath so long flourished under it, your majesty do not draw upon this kingdom in general, and yourself in particular, God’s heavy wrath and indignation.”

It must be stated, that some persons have doubted whether Abbot really wrote this letter. But it so certainly expressed the opinions of the party of which he was the head, that it was believed to be his. Whether really his or not, therefore, does not alter its importance.

When such was the spirit of the age, we may readily believe that the government considered itself as acting mildly when it subjected these men first to a fine and

then to the pillory and imprisonment : but a sentence to the pillory implied the amputation of their ears, and few things excite our feelings of indignant compassion so much as mutilation. Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, underwent their sentence with great fortitude. Archbishop Laud has had all the odium for the sentence passed upon these Ultra-protestants ; and Evangelicals, as well as Sectarians, have reprobated his memory, as if he had been the proposer of it. This, however, is not true. He was merely a member of the court. He spoke on the occasion, but it was only in vindication of himself ; he did not deliver an opinion in the court, and he did not openly coincide with the sentence, however just he may have privately thought it. He expressly says, in the last passage of his speech :—" But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, *I shall forbear to censure them*, and leave them to God's mercy and the king's justice." But when the court had decided upon the sentence, we know Laud's opinion of the manner in which it was carried into effect. The fault of Charles's government was, that it was apt to do just enough to provoke and irritate, but not enough to silence and terrify the evil doer. When a course of conduct was decided upon, Laud was for pursuing it " thorough." And on this occasion, writing to Strafford, he says :—" What think you of " thorough," when there can be such slips in business of consequence ? What say you to it, that Prynne and his fellows should be suffered to talk what they pleased, while they stood in the pillory and win acclamations from the people ?"

Prynne was publicly fêted by the corporation of Chester, on his way to Carnarvon Castle ; and all three were allowed to enjoy, in open day, the full honours of martyrdom which their party paid them. The Puritans, when in power, were not so liberal to the king or the archbishop.

If these men were the representatives of the Ultra-protestants of the time, and if this spirit of Ultra-protes-

tantism had gained possession of the people, we are not to be surprised at finding the deep curse of Almighty God alighting upon the nation. Bishop Butler is of opinion that madness may seize a nation as well as an individual; and for the sins of Puritanism, the English nation was now demented. When this is the case, every act of government only tends to offer fuel to the madness of the people, and demagogues avail themselves of whatever is done to inflame the passions of the multitude. The republication of the Book of Sports was one of those acts of which the demagogues availed themselves now, when the whole nation had been debauched by Puritanism, a religion of phrases and of doctrines, but utterly void of, and directly opposed to, the Gospel.

The Catholic Church has always regarded the Lord's day as a feast, commemorative of our Saviour's resurrection, just as Friday is a fast in commemoration of the atoning sacrifice of the Cross. As a feast it was observed in Queen Elizabeth's time, when Archbishop Whitgift used to give his large county dinner parties on Whitsunday. But the Ultra-protestants have rejected all Church authority; and, disregarding tradition, appeal to the Bible, and the Bible only. But the Bible is silent as to the institution of the Lord's day, though it is copious on the subject of the Sabbath; the texts, therefore, for the observance of the Sabbath, were quoted as binding upon Christians. The more honest and consistent of the Puritans perceived that if the passages of the Old Testament, relating to the Sabbath, are binding now, they relate not to the Sunday, but to Saturday, for there is not one word in Scripture about changing the Sabbath. If there is a scriptural Sabbath, that Sabbath ought to be on the last, not the first, day of the week. But, in spite of Puritanism, traditional practice asserted its authority, and Sunday was still observed, though called the Sabbath, in order to bring the Sabbatarian passages of Scripture to bear upon its observance. But if the Sunday was to be a



Sabbath, it must be observed with the strictness of a Jewish Sabbath. It was to counteract these novel notions that King James published the Book of Sports, in which he asserted the lawfulness of recreation on the Lord's day, after an attendance at Church. This was republished by King Charles, with a supplement, owing to the extravagant zeal of Chief Justice Richardson, who, in 1631, had assumed the power in his own person of prohibiting every amusement, and who commanded his order to be published at the door of the parochial churches. This being an encroachment on the functions of the bishop of the diocese, without whose knowledge it was done, Laud complained of it to the king; but Richardson, so far from revoking his order, made it more rigorous than before. Laud afterwards wrote to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, to transmit to court a full account of the feasts called wakes, and whether the disorders arising from them might not be remedied, without prohibiting the feasts themselves. The bishop returned an answer, certified by upwards of seventy of his clergy, that "the ancient custom of those feasts was laudable and innocent, that the late suppression was unpopular, and that their restitution would be acceptable to the people at large." This, and other remonstrances from the county of Essex, caused Richardson to be reproved at the council table, for an assumption of authority which did not belong to him; and so severely was he rebuked by Laud, in particular, that he ran out exclaiming, "That he had been almost choked with a pair of lawn sleeves." At the next assizes he was compelled to revoke his order, which he did with considerable reluctance.

This was followed by the republication of the Book of Sports, as has been before observed, and no sooner was it published than the Puritans commenced a universal clamour. Some abused the king, and termed the declaration a "profane edict," a "maintaining of his own honour," "a toleration for profaning the Lord's day,"

while others charged Archbishop Laud with the whole affair, "and made it," says Heylyn, "the first remarkable thing which was done presently after he took possession of his *graceship*, as Burton remarked wittily in his pulpit libel." At his trial it was brought against him with increased malignity, but, though he denied it, he admitted that he was not an enemy to innocent recreations on Sundays. "That some are lawful," says he, "after the public service of God is ended, appears by the practice of Geneva, where, after evening prayer, the elder men bowl, and the younger train;" and this was done even in Calvin's time, who did not want authority to denounce those practices had he been so inclined. And, in proof, he quotes that remarkable passage from Calvin's Institutes, "That those men who stand so strictly on the morality of the Sabbath, do, by a gross and carnal sabbatizing, three times exceed the superstition of the Jews;" adding, also, remarks Fuller, the Church historian, that, "though indulging liberty to others, in his own person he strictly observed that day—a *self-praise*, or rather *self-purging*, because spoken during his life, which, uttered without pride, and with truth, was not clearly confuted. Indeed, they are the best carvers of liberty on that day, who cut most for others, and keep least to themselves."

One great error of Archbishop Laud was his notion of serving the Church by placing ecclesiastics in high offices of state. This had been done in the middle ages; but there were then but few among the laity either willing or competent to undertake the duties of office; and if the Church gained power, so as more fully to enforce her Canons, it, nevertheless, became secularized by the worldly employments of the clergy. Laud, however, viewed the case in another point of view, and became unpopular by interfering with the interests of the courtiers. In 1634-5, he was himself put into the committee of trade and the king's revenue; and on the

death of Weston, Earl of Rutland, was appointed one of the commissioners of the treasury. Lord Cottington, one of the most artful of courtiers, who was chancellor of the exchequer, took all opportunities of imposing upon the archbishop, whose easy nature was often a prey to the cunning of his opponent. After having continued a year in the treasury, he procured the lord treasurer's staff for Juxon, Bishop of London, to the disgust of many noble candidates for the honour, but much to the advantage of the king, whom Juxon served faithfully, while he maintained in office so high a character that he was not even impeached by the commons. While pushing the supremacy of the Church upon the court and nation, Laud was encouraging learned men, such as Chillingworth, the ever-memorable Hales, and Bishop Hall, and enriching his university with books, manuscripts, and buildings.

We now approach another important period, namely, the year 1640. Rebellion had been triumphant in Scotland. The bishops had retreated to England, with the exception of Bishop Guthrie, who nobly braved the danger, and three prelates who ignominiously signed their recantation. Many of the clergy were deposed, and orthodox professors were driven from the university. The principles of those who not only professed and called themselves Christians, but like modern Ultra-protestants, regarded themselves as the *only* Christians, may be gathered from the following passage of Bishop Burnet:—"The pulpits," says he, "sounded with the ruin of religion and liberties, and that all might now look for popery and bondage, if they did not acquit themselves like men. Curses were thundered out against those who went not out to help the angel of the Lord against the mighty, so oddly was the Scripture applied; and to set off this the better, all was carried with so many fasts and prayers. By this means it was that the poor and well-meaning people were animated into great



extremities of zeal, resolving to hazard all in pursuance of the cause." In proportion as they advanced in power, and the war in violence, the unparalleled cruelties of the Covenanting leaders increased. They glutted their eyes with the executions of *malignants*, and one fanatical Covenanting minister, after witnessing one hundred executions of *malignants*, declared, "*This wark gaes bonnilie on.*"

The king prepared to meet the Scotch dissenters now in open rebellion, and the archbishop was directed to write to his clergy to contribute towards the support of the royal army. Although he only obeyed the orders of the privy council, this circumstance procured for his grace the appellation of Incendiary, and of one who laboured "to set two nations into a bloody war." Let us hear, however, his own declarations on the subject, after he was in prison, which none of his enemies controverted:—"God knows," says he, "I laboured long for peace, till I received a great check for my labour. And particularly at the beginning of these tumults, when the miseries of a war first began, in the year 1638, openly at the council table, at Theobalds, *my counsel alone* prevailed for peace and forbearance, in hope that the Scots would think better of their obedience."

After a variety of transactions, generally unfortunate for the king, a temporary pacification was agreed to, on the 17th of July, and ratified by the king on the 18th, after which he returned to London, nominating the Earl of Traquair his lord high commissioner. Nevertheless, the mutual jealousies had not subsided; no sooner was the treaty concluded than it was broken by the Covenanters, and the war commenced the following year with redoubled violence. Our attention, however, must be more immediately confined to the archbishop. On the 3rd of April, we find him reconciled to the queen, with whom he was now on terms of intimate friendship. On the 4th of June he received two seditious and scurrilous

papers, written by Lilburne, then in the Fleet prison ; the one abusing him to the lord mayor and aldermen, the other inciting the apprentices of London to attack his palace. These he delivered to the lords of the council the 5th of June, but his moderation seems to have inflicted no farther censure on this fierce and daring enthusiast.

In the midst of these national commotions and attacks of fanatical hatred, it is pleasing to find this great man unmoved, and still appearing the patron of literature and learned men. On the 28th of June, he sent 576 volumes of manuscripts to Oxford, being what he calls the remainder, and above 100 of these were Hebrew, Persian, and Arabic. "I had formerly sent them," says he, "above 700 volumes." Such was his zeal for literature, that he spared no expence to benefit that venerable seat of learning, where he himself had first been taught to appreciate the value of knowledge.

Another of the archbishop's actions this year must not be forgotten. He had already caused the Scottish liturgy to be translated into Latin ; for, as that language, though it had long ceased to be vernacular, was still the language of learned men, he wished the whole world to judge of the conduct of the Scots, as to the truth of their allegations that it was Popish. The work, unfortunately, though finished, was never published, his troubles coming on apace. Still, there was the liturgy of England, in many respects the same, translated into various languages, by which an adequate judgment could be formed of the conduct of the Scottish schismatics. It had undergone various translations : the first, that of King Edward VI., into Latin, by Alexander Alice, or Alesius, a learned Scotsman, of the University of St. Andrew's, who fled from the vengeance of Archbishop Beaton, at the commencement of that tumultuous Reformation ; the second Liturgy of that prince, at the command of Elizabeth, by Dr. Walter Haddon, the learned president of Magdalen College, Oxford. It had also been translated

into French, for the use of Jersey, Guernsey, and the other Norman British isles ; while Dr. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, when lord keeper, procured its translation into Spanish. Our archbishop was not behind, and Petley, of Oxford, at his instance, translated it into the Greek language, “ that so,” says Heylyn, “ the Eastern Churches might have as clear information of the English piety as the Western.”

The difficulties of the king increasing, the archbishop united with his friend Lord Strafford and the Marquis of Hamilton, in proposing that a parliament should be called. The 13th of April was the day fixed for the meeting of this assembly. No sooner was it opened than complaints, more loud and tumultuous than ever, were uplifted by the covenanters, against the bishops of the Church of England. Religion was on the lips of the fanatics, while treason was in their hearts. It was the very life and soul of their hateful policy, to direct the whole torrent of public execration against the hierarchy. They knew that the throne would, probably, remain impregnable, so long as the Church retained her authority and strength. And, accordingly, they proclaimed aloud that the reformed religion never could be safe, until the dignities of the Church were trampled in the dust. And this nefarious stratagem was adopted by them, with as little remorse, as the men of carnal warfare resort to the countermarch, or the mine, or the ambuscade. In the meantime, although the rebellion was becoming, every hour, more fierce and insolent, there appeared no prospect whatever, of any supply for its suppression. At length, Sir Harry Vane, the elder, then secretary of state, declared, in plain terms, to his Majesty, that, to his knowledge, it would be idle to hope for any money against the Scots. This information was false, and, most probably, treacherous ; and agonizing was the regret of Charles, for having listened to it, in a moment of impatience and precipitancy. The result of it was,



that, on the 5th of May, 1640, the short parliament, as it was called, was madly and fatally dissolved. In the resolution for this measure, the dissentient voices were only two; those of the Earls of Northumberland and Holland. It happened, accidentally, that Laud arrived at the board too late to join in the deliberations of the council, and so co-operated only by his single vote. Nevertheless, the whole guilt of the transaction was heaped upon him. The outcry still was, that the dissolution was his work. The very next day, libels were posted, in various parts of the city, provocative of insurrection. And on Saturday, the 9th of May, a paper was found upon the Old Exchange, inviting the apprentices, with others of the rabble, to assemble in St. George's Fields, "to hunt William, the Fox, for breaking up the parliament." On the Monday night following, an assault was made on Lambeth Palace by a mob of 500 ruffians, who threatened to tear the archbishop in pieces. Fortunately, he had received notice of the design, and had fortified the house in a manner sufficient for his protection from personal violence. Such, however, was the fury manifested by the assailants, that, by the king's command, he lodged, for several days and nights after the attack, in the palace at Whitehall. "This scandalous and headless insurrection" was quelled by the apprehension and execution of one of the most active ringleaders, who was hanged and quartered on Saturday, the 23rd of May, 1640.

Previously to the ending of the parliament, the Convocation had agreed to grant his Majesty six subsidies, amounting, in the whole, to £120,000; but payable in six years, by equal annual portions. Immediately on the dissolution, the archbishop sent to terminate the Convocation likewise; forgetting, in the haste and agitation of the moment, that the king's writ was requisite, as well for its dissolution, as for its assembling. On being reminded of this, he applied to his Majesty for a writ.

To his great surprise, the king signified his pleasure that the Convocation should continue their session; first, in order that they might complete their grant of the six subsidies; and, secondly, that they might finish certain Canons, which were then under consideration. The archbishop was much perplexed and troubled at this resolution. He had received no previous intimation of it; and he considered both the lawfulness and the expediency of the measure, as extremely questionable. He was, nevertheless, unable to shake the determination of the king; and was compelled to content himself with obtaining his majesty's consent to have the question submitted to the lord keeper, and the crown lawyers, for the better assurance and satisfaction of the clergy. Their answer was, that "the Convocation, being called by the king's writ, under the great seal, doth continue, until it be dissolved by writ, or commission, under the great seal, *notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved.*" The Convocation continued to sit, accordingly, till the 29th of May. They perfected their act for the contribution to the king; and they framed seventeen Canons for the better government and peace of the Church. The only dissentient was Dr. Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, who had long been suspected of a secret inclination to the Romish doctrines; and who, on this occasion, declared to Laud, that he would be torn by wild horses, rather than subscribe the Canon for suppressing the growth of Popery. On the first publication of these Canons, they were received with general approbation. Letters were addressed to the archbishop from all parts of the kingdom, expressive of this sentiment. But, within a little month after they were printed, the London ministers began to whisper against them; then, to clamour loudly; and, lastly, to circulate their complaints in writing: till at length this whole body of ordinances was vehemently tried out upon; and as usual, the main fury of the tempest fell upon the head of the archbishop.

Of all the proceedings of this synod, there was none which drew upon the Church a heavier load of obloquy, than the insertion of an oath, which was to be imposed, not only on all the clergy, but on many of the laity; and by which they were to declare that they never would consent to any alteration in the government of the Church, by bishops, deans, archdeacons, &c. Every one, in his right senses, must have seen that this *et cetera* had been introduced solely for the purpose of avoiding a needless enumeration of offices. Nevertheless, an insane, and almost universal outcry was raised against it by the *agitators* of the day. It was spoken of as a snare and pit-fall. It was denounced as the entrance into a yawning abyss of perjury. It was held up to universal detestation, under the name of the *et cetera* oath; and by that name it has ever since been known. But, further, the whole oath itself was furiously censured as “wicked and ungodly;” and was afterwards condemned by the commons, as devised by the archbishop, for the purpose of “confirming the unlawful and exorbitant power which had been usurped over his majesty’s subjects.” It was lastly contended that the imposition of any oath whatever, was an act beyond the legal power of the Convocation. This outcry, though plausible enough, was purely the dictate of malignity and faction. For, as Laud affirmed on his trial, even if the law was against the bishops on this point, still there were various precedents hitherto unquestioned, decidedly in their favour: so that, at the very worst, their delinquency amounted to no more than a mistake of the law, and not to a wilful and treasonable violation of it. Nevertheless, the attempt was insisted on as conclusive of the malicious and despotic temper which pervaded the whole hierarchy!”

The Canons passed were seventeen in number, which, as Lord Clarendon observes, bear more against Socinianism than the acts of any other Christian assembly. They were published in quarto, under the authority of the



great seal, and are entitled, "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Archbishop of Canterbury and York, presidents of the Convocations for the respective provinces of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of those provinces," and are accompanied by a royal proclamation. The titles of the several heads are:—1. Concerning regal power. 2. For the better keeping of the day of his majesty's most happy inauguration. 3. For suppressing the growth of popery. 4. Against Socinianism, which is termed a "damnable and cursed heresy," a "wicked and blasphemous heresy." 5. Against sectaries, to wit, "Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists, or other sect or sects." 6. An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and governments. 7. A declaration concerning some rites and ceremonies. 8. Of preaching for conformity. 9. One book of articles to be used at all parochial visitations. 10. Concerning the consecration of the clergy. 11. Chancellors' patents. 12. Chancellors alone not to censure any of the clergy in sundry cases. 13. Excommunication and absolution not to be pronounced but by a priest. 14. Concerning commutations, and the disposal of them. 15. Touching concurrent jurisdictions. 16. Concerning licences to marry. 17. Against vexatious citations."

The Canons were the great business of the Convocation then, though "some other things there were in proportion and design that never ripened into act of execution." One of these designs was an English *pontifical*, which was to contain the *form* of his majesty's coronation, to serve for future ages on all similar occasions. Another was a *form* for the consecration of churches and churchyards; and a third for reconciling those who had been under penance, or who had revolted from the faith to Mahometanism. It was proposed that these three services, with the offices for confirmation and ordination, should form a distinct volume. The design was, how-

ever frustrated by the troubles of the times. Exceptions also were taken to the prayer in the 55th Canon, and a short prayer was drawn up, containing the heads of that in the Canon; "and being so drawn up," says Heylyn, "it was to have been tendered by the hands of one of the clergy, who would have undertaken that it should be universally received by all those which dislike the other." Laud, however, fearful of a new experiment, preferred adhering to the Canon which was formed on the injunctions of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth.

The archbishop was now aware that his life was in danger. He did not probably expect to die on the scaffold, but he knew that assassination was at this time justified by the dissenters in Scotland, and he had a warning that the same doctrine had obtained among the Ultra-protestants of England. On the 21st September, 1640, he received a letter, signed by a person unknown, in which the writer intimated, that while he was travelling through the Bishopric of Durham, he heard it openly declared by the Covenanters, that they hoped to see him shortly meet the dark fate of the Duke of Buckingham; and the writer concluded by advising him to be on his guard. Fearing that the rabble would give him another visit at Lambeth Palace, he ordered the high commission court to assemble at St. Paul's. His apprehensions were not groundless; for on the 22d of October, about 2,000 fanatics, named Brownists, or Independents and Anabaptists, commenced a tumultuous uproar in the court, destroyed the benches in the consistory, and exclaimed that they would have no bishops, no high commission. Here, also, it was found necessary to station a guard to repel the furious Puritans, who had now, observes Heylyn, "grown so audacious in these disorders, partly from the near approach of the parliament, but principally by the invasion of the Scots, that they contemned the law, and defied the magistrates."

These were all sufficient indications to the archbishop

of his approaching ruin, and indeed he seems to have been long aware that he would fall a victim to fanatical schism and rebellion, and to have prepared himself for it with heroic fortitude. "Now verging," says his chaplain, "towards the age of seventy years, the period which the Psalmist had assigned to the life of man, there wanted not many sad presages of his fall and death." Long had his ruin been meditated by the Puritans. From the first moment of his entrance into public life, their persecutions and calumnies had been bitter and unrelenting. His enemies were many and powerful; the faction to which they adhered every day acquired strength by the wild fanaticism and rebellion engendered by the northern Covenanters. The whole of the Puritans were arrayed against him, whether Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Familists, Gospellers: the Jesuits, too, had intrigued against him who was the greatest enemy which Rome ever had since the days of Luther; and Puritans, Monks, and Covenanters, all united in one common cause. Many of the nobility, and almost the whole of the Scottish nation were leagued against him; several of whom forgot the signal services he had rendered them, in their haste to exult ingloriously over the ruin of an upright man, venerable from his age, his virtues, and the sanctity of his episcopal character. The Puritans, who charged him with what they were pleased to term innovations in religion, and who falsely alleged that he was the original promoter of the troubles, because he had so often restrained their seditious practices:—the Jesuits, because his vigorous conduct had defeated their designs, and his learning had produced a volume which Rome has felt, and will never cease to feel, while she retains her deluding superstitions and her destructive politics:—the nobility, because his integrity made him disdain the petty artifices of courts, and the dastardly intrigues of faction, and because his zeal for justice sometimes transported him into an incautious and hasty warmth of



expression, by which he refused to listen to the insinuations of corruption :—and, finally, the Scottish Covenanters, among whom the Calvinistic tenets had widely spread, exasperated because they conceived him to be the main instrument in maintaining the apostolical order of the Scottish Church, and falsely charging him with the composition and introduction of that admirable Liturgy, which the miserable old women, stimulated by Henderson, Dickson, Cant, and others, were the ignoble and inglorious agents in defeating by riot, tumult, profanation, and rebellion—all these, dissimilar and opposite as they were in their sentiments and dispositions, combined together for the destruction of this great and illustrious man.

On the 3d of November, the long Parliament met, which became the most blood-thirsty tribunal that ever sat until the period of the French revolution. They began by murdering the noble Strafford, and completed their crimes by the murder of the venerable Laud, and of their sainted sovereign.

The cry that religion was in danger from the machinations of Popery was revived, and of Popery it was insinuated that the king as well as the archbishop were the patrons. These Ultra-protestants, consisting of the Presbyterians, the Independents, and those Puritan Churchmen who then, as now, accorded with dissenters in principle, formed the popular body, and they petitioned for the execution of Goodman, a priest who had received judgment of death for having taken orders in the Church of Rome. They formed themselves into an inquisition to “purge the Church”, and condemning as scandalous every conscientious Churchman, replaced those who had been deprived of their preferments for refusing to conform to the Church, and they proceeded to the impeachment of Strafford, conducting his trial with pitiless rancour, and without any regard to justice; and at length, taking for their patron the most unconstitutional of our monarchs, Henry VIII., these champions

in the cause of freedom abandoned the way of impeachment, and proceeded by that of attainder. They thirsted for the blood of their victim, the greatest man in England, and when they could not succeed by law, they condemned him in spite of the law.

The dissenters from this time were the *de facto* governors of England, and by them the murder of the pious archbishop was determined upon. On the 18th of December, after half an hour's debate, it was resolved that a message should be sent to the House of Lords, to accuse him of high treason. The speeches which preceded this resolution were outrageously and infamously virulent, more especially that of Sir Harbottle Grimstone; who described the archbishop as "the sty of all the pestilential filth which had infested the state and government of the commonwealth." On the same day, Denzil Hollis, the brother-in-law of Strafford, appeared at the bar of the house of lords, in the name of the commons of England, to impeach the Archbishop of Canterbury of high treason. Upon this, he was consigned to the custody of Mr. James Maxwell, the usher of the black rod; but was first permitted to repair to Lambeth, for the purpose of collecting such papers as might be required for his justification, and of selecting some few books for his employment and recreation during his confinement. He remained at Lambeth till the night, in order that he might avoid the intrusion of the gazing populace. In the evening, he attended prayers in the chapel; where he derived great comfort from the 93rd and 94th Psalms, and from the 50th chapter of Isaiah, which formed a part of the services of the day: and, assuredly, few portions of Scripture could be found more exactly appropriate to his condition. He afterwards prepared for departure. And, as he was on his way to his barge, he found hundreds of his poor neighbours waiting for him, and praying for his safe return to his own house. Having given them his parting benediction, he embarked for Westminster. These sim-

ple particulars are noted in his own Diary; and they prove, beyond all question, his habitual practice of liberality and kindness, and his profound sense of religious consolation in adversity.

It was hinted to him on the 21st of January following, by several of the peers, that the moderation of his demeanour had been noticed by the upper house, and had considerably abated the edge of their resentment, so that he might possibly escape with banishment from the court, and the loss of his archbishopric. The tender mercies of the wicked, we are told, are cruel. And this seems to have been felt by Laud upon receiving the above most gracious intimation. His reflection upon it is, "I see what justice I may expect. Here is a resolution taken, not only before my answer, but before my charge was brought up against me."

Prynne, who had been condemned, as before related, as a seditious libeller, but who was regarded by the Ultra-Protestants as a pious martyr,—his libels having been directed against the sovereign and the archbishop, had now been released from prison, and was received in triumph by the dissenters. He gave further proof of his religion by the revengeful spirit with which he pursued the archbishop because he had been one of his judges, although the archbishop had himself refused to join in the sentence against him, because his libels bore upon himself. By mendacity unequalled, and by recourse to all those arts of iniquity to which the Jewish Pharisees had recourse when they determined to shed the innocent blood, Prynne determined to effect the death of the archbishop.

It is affecting to find the archbishop, at this very time, praying for his enemies thus:—

"O Lord, I beseech Thee, forgive mine enemies all their sins against Thee, and give me that measure of Thy grace, that for their hatred I may love them, for their cursing I may bless them, for their injury I may do them



good, and for their persecution I may pray for them; Lord, I pray for them, forgive them, for they know not what they do. Amen.

“Deus pacis et charitatis, da omnibus inimicis mihi pacem et charitatem, omniumque remissionem peccatorum, meque ab eorum insidiis potenter eripe; per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.”

But the enemies of the archbishop being at a loss how to act, had recourse to those arts which Ultra protestants have not, even in these days, renounced. Mr. Le Bas remarks, that after he was placed in the custody of the black rod, all the winds of obloquy were let loose upon him. The council-chamber, the star-chamber, the court of high commission—all were discovered to have been the scenes of his triumphant iniquity. No complaint could be made, in the upper or the lower house, relative to any place or thing, in which he had ever been concerned, but *he* was found to have been the principal minister of evil. The agents of mischief were unwearied in their search for excitements, by which the hatred of the people might be inflamed to madness. The tumultuous ovation with which Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, were brought back to London, was the signal for a fresh discharge of all the artillery of popular malice. Ballads and libels were issued, prodigious in multitude, and monstrous in scurrility and falsehood; and all directed against the person and calling of the archbishop. The lies went forth in swarms, unscared by censure or prohibition from the parliament; to the scandal of honest men and to the disgrace of a Christian community. Indeed, the whole treatment of the archbishop, from this time to the moment of his death, affords a splendid specimen of the justice and the mercy of revolutionary tribunals. It would seem as if the malice of his assailants, when baffled (as it long was) by the difficulty of finding treasonable matter against him, indemnified itself by calculating on his demolition,

at the rate of so many grains a day. The period for which he remained under the charge of the gentleman usher, was no less than ten weeks; and, during the whole of this interval, the fees due to that functionary, together with the expenses of the archbishop's diet, amounted to twenty nobles a day; making, in the whole, a sum of £436 and upwards; all of which was received by the head lictor, without the abatement of a single penny. We learn from Heylyn, that, during his confinement at Mr. Maxwell's, his gentle and patient demeanour so completely won for him the good opinion of the gentlewoman of the house, that she reported of him to her companions, that, although he was but a silly fellow to hold converse with a lady, he was the most excellent and pious soul she had ever met with. But he was now about to appear once more, before an assembly, who were unwilling to give him credit for a single virtue. On the 26th of February, 1641, the articles of impeachment were brought up from the commons to the lords; and, thereupon, a vote was passed for transferring him to the Tower. The archbishop was then ordered to attend the house; and there the articles were read to him at the bar.

It is needless here to recapitulate the articles exhibited against the archbishop; it is enough to say that he was charged with being the sole cause of all those evils which afflicted the kingdom, although they were justly chargeable on the dissenting party. These fourteen articles he has separately answered in the affecting history of his "Troubles and Trials," and with inimitable eloquence and clearness. The archbishop when the charge was brought against him, replied in an address which ought to have covered his accusers with confusion.

On the 1st of March he was committed to the Tower, amidst the loud and fierce clamours of a pious mob. The people now conspired with their rulers for his destruction; and the conduct both of rulers and of people, pretending

a zeal for religion, forcibly reminds us of the conduct of the Jewish Pharisees and the Jewish people, when they conspired against the Divine Master of the poor archbishop. The patience of Laud was not disturbed for a moment. "I look," he said, "upon a higher cause than the tongues of Shimei and his children." The following is found among his Private Devotions:—

"If I find favour in Thine eyes, O Lord, Thou wilt bring me again, and shew me both the ark and the tabernacle, and set me right in Thy service, and make me joyful and glad in Thee. But if Thou say (O for Jesus His sake say it not,) I have no pleasure in thee; behold, here I am, do with me as seemeth good in Thine own eyes. Amen.

"O Lord, though I be afflicted on every side, let me not be in distress: though in want of some of Thy comforts, yet not of all: though I be chastened, yet let me not be forsaken: though I be cast down, let me not perish: and though my outward man decay and perish, yet let my inward man be renewed daily, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord, whatsoever Thou shalt lay upon me, I will hold my peace, and not open my mouth, because it is Thy doing and my deserving. Amen.

"O Lord, Thou hast dealt graciously with Thy servant according to Thy word. For before I was troubled I went wrong, but now have I prayed that I may keep Thy law. And it is good for me that I have been in trouble, that so I may learn still to keep it better, in the mercies of Jesus Christ. Amen.

"I know, O Lord, that Thy judgments are right, and that Thou of very faithfulness hast caused me to be troubled. O let Thy merciful kindness be my comfort, according to Thy word unto Thy servant, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord Almighty, O God of Israel, the soul that is in trouble, and the spirit that is vexed, crieth unto Thee. Hear, O Lord, and have mercy, for Thou art merciful,



and have pity upon me, because I have sinned before Thee. For Thou endurest for ever, but unless Thou have mercy I utterly perish. Have mercy, therefore, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“O Lord, remember Thy promise, that the poor shall not always be forgotten, nor the patient abiding of the meek perish for ever. Amen.

“Lord, I will be glad and rejoice in Thy mercy, for Thou hast considered my trouble, and hast known my soul in adversities. Amen.

“Have mercy upon me, O Lord, for I am in trouble, and mine eye is consumed for very heaviness, yea, my soul and my body. My strength faileth me because of mine iniquity, and my bones are consumed: I am even belike a broken vessel. For I have heard the blasphemy of the multitude, and fear is on every side. But my hope hath been and is in Thee, O Lord, Thou art my God, save and deliver me for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“Why art thou so full of heaviness, O my soul, and why art thou so disquieted within me? O put thy trust in God, that I may yet give Him thanks for the help of His countenance. O my God, my soul is vexed within me, therefore will I remember Thee. Amen.

“Up, Lord, why sleepest Thou? Awake, and be not absent from us for ever; wherefore hidest Thou Thy face, and forgettest our misery and trouble? For our soul is brought low, even unto the dust, our belly cleaves unto the ground. Arise, O Lord, and help us, and deliver us for Thy mercies sake. Amen.

“In Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust, let me never be put to confusion, deliver me in Thy righteousness. Bow down Thine ear to me, make haste to deliver me. Be Thou my strong rock and house of defence, that Thou mayest save me. Be also my guide, and lead me for Thy name's sake. Amen.

“O God, the enemy crieth so, and the ungodly cometh

on so fast, that they threaten to overbear me, they are minded to do me some mischief, so maliciously are they set against me. My heart is disquieted within me, and the fear of death is fallen upon me. Fearfulness and trembling and an horrible dread hath overwhelmed me. And I said, O that I had wings like a dove, that I might fly away and be at rest; that I might make haste to escape the stormy wind and tempest. But be Thou my helper, and I will magnify Thee, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer. Amen.

“O be Thou my help in trouble, for vain is the help of man. Amen.

“Gracious Father! the life of man is a warfare upon earth, and the dangers which assault us are diversly pointed against us. I humbly beseech Thee be present with me in all the course and passages of my life; but especially in the services of my calling. Suffer no malice to be able to hurt me, no cunning to circumvent me, no violence to oppress me, no falsehood to betray me. That which I cannot foresee, I beseech Thee prevent; that which I cannot withstand, I beseech Thee master; that which I do not fear, I beseech Thee unmask and frustrate; that being delivered from all danger, both of soul and body, I may praise Thee the deliverer, and see how happy a thing it is to make the Lord of Hosts my helper in the day of fear and trouble. Especially, O Lord, bless and preserve me at this time from, &c., that I may glorify Thee for this deliverance also, and be safe in the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ my only Lord and Saviour. Amen.

“O Lord, Thou hast fed me with the bread of affliction, and given me plenty of tears to drink. I am become a very strife to my neighbours, and mine enemies laugh me to scorn. But turn Thou again, Thou God of Hosts, shew me the light of Thy countenance, and I shall be whole. Amen.

“Help me, O Lord my God, O save me according to

Thy mercy ; and then the world shall know that this is Thy hand, and that Thou, Lord, hast done it. Amen. Lord Jesu, Amen.

“If my delight had not been in Thy law, I should have perished in my trouble. O, continue my delight. Amen.”

On his being committed to prison, he was accustomed to pray thus:—

“O Lord, have mercy upon me, and bring my soul out of prison, that I may give thanks unto Thy name, even in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“O Lord, blessed is the man that hath Thee for his help, and whose hope is in Thee. O Lord, help me and all them to right that suffer wrong. Thou art the Lord, which looseth men out of prison, which helpeth them that are fallen. O Lord, help and deliver me, when and as it shall seem best to Thee, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“O Lord, Thine indignation lies hard upon me ; and though Thou hast not (for Thy mercy is great) vexed me with all Thy storms, yet Thou hast put my acquaintance far from me, and I am so fast in prison that I cannot get forth. Lord, I call daily upon Thee, hear and have mercy, for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“O Lord, Thou which bringest the prisoners out of captivity, while Thou lettest the runagates continue in scarceness, have mercy upon me, and deliver me out of the prison and affliction in which I now am ; and give me grace, that, being free, I may faithfully and freely serve Thee all the days of my life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Laud might have escaped from the Tower, but he perceived that by so doing he would have injured that cause of true religion for which he was prepared to die a martyr's death. Of the doom which awaited him, if he remained in the Tower, he received a mournful warning, in the trial and execution of his illustrious friend the



Earl of Strafford. The royal master of Laud, in the hour of agony which extorted his consent to the sacrifice of that earl, needed the presence of an inflexible and courageous counsellor, who would loudly protest against the abandonment of a devoted and heroic servant; one who would not, like Williams, tell his sovereign that he had a private conscience and a public conscience; and that, on matters of public import, he was at liberty to consult the one, and disregard the other. This service, the adamant integrity of Laud might have rendered to his master, in that hour of darkness. But the children of disobedience had been wise in their generation. They had felt how expedient it was to deprive the king's unsteady mind of all firm support; and, accordingly, Laud was then in the Tower, instead of being at the council table of his sovereign.

On the night previous to his execution, Strafford urgently requested the lieutenant of the Tower to allow him an interview with the archbishop; offering that it should be in the presence of the lieutenant himself, "so that he might hear all that should pass between them: for," said he, "it is no time now for him to plot *heresy*, or for me to plot *treason*." The lieutenant alleged that his orders were peremptory against it; and that the indulgence could only be obtained by a petition to the parliament. "No," replied Strafford, "I have gotten my despatch from them, and will trouble them no more. I am now petitioning a higher court; where neither partiality can be expected, nor error feared." He then turned to the primate of Ireland, who had been permitted to attend him, and said, "I will tell you what I should have spoken to my Lord's Grace of Canterbury. You shall desire the archbishop to lend me his prayers, when I do go abroad to-morrow; and that he will be in his window, that by my last farewell I may give him thanks for this, and all his former favours." The archbishop, on hearing this message, replied that he was bound, by

last observance towards his chamber. In the meantime, the archbishop, being apprized of the approach of Strafford, appeared at the window; upon which the earl, bowing himself to the ground, exclaimed, "My Lord, your prayers, and your blessing." Laud immediately lifted up his hands, pronounced his parting benediction, and then instantly fell back, fainting under the anguish of that bitter moment. The last words of Strafford to him were, "Farewell, my Lord; may God protect your innocence!" The archbishop, it seems, was almost ashamed of having sunk under the pressure of his feelings. He was fearful lest it should be ascribed to effeminate weakness of spirit. And, therefore, when he had recovered himself, he expressed a hope (which was amply and nobly justified by the event) that his own fate would be found to move him less than the execution of his friend. And good reason there was, he added, every obligation of conscience and affection, to comply with the request; but feared that his weakness and passion would not lend him eyes to behold the departure of his friend. The next morning, when Strafford was on his way to the scaffold, as he approached the lodgings of the archbishop, he remarked that he did not see his grace; but, nevertheless, requested permission to do his that it should be so. For neither he, nor any other Churchman, had ever rendered such services to the Church as the Earl of Strafford.

It is unnecessary, and our space will not permit us, to narrate the various insults the archbishop patiently endured when in prison, where Ultra-protestant piety was exhibited in the fiercest denunciations against him from the pulpit of the Tower Chapel, while Ultra-protestant veracity was exercised in the circulation of falsehoods, through the press, to exasperate the people against the representatives of the Church. What were his feelings, during this time, may be gathered from the following prayers:—

“ Lord, turn Thee unto me, and have mercy upon me, for I am desolate and in misery. The sorrows of my heart are enlarged; O bring Thou me out of my troubles. Look upon mine adversity and misery, and forgive me all my sins, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“ Hear my crying, O God, give ear unto my prayer; from the ends of the earth, whithersoever Thou shalt cast me, I will call upon Thee when my heart is in heaviness. O set me upon the rock that is higher than I, to be my hope and a strong tower against my oppressors. Amen.

“ Save me, O God, for the waters are entered into my soul. I stick fast in the deep mire where no stay is, I am come into deep waters, and the streams run over me. They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of my head, and they which would destroy me causeless are mighty. O let not these waterfloods drown me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me. Hear me. O Lord, for Thy loving kindness is great, turn unto me according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies. Hide not Thy face from Thy servant, for I am in trouble, but draw near unto my soul, and redeem it, for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

“ My soul melteth away for very heaviness, comfort Thou me according to Thy Word. Amen.

“ O Lord, trouble and heaviness have taken hold upon me; patience, good Lord, that for all this my delight may be in Thy commandments. Amen.

“ O Lord, my sins have made me a rebuke to my neighbours, and to be laughed to scorn of them that are round about me. O suffer me not longer to be a by-word among the people. My confusion is daily before me, and the shame of my face hath covered me. The voice of the slanderer and blasphemer hath overtaken me. And though all this be come upon me, suffer me not, O Lord, to forget Thee, or to behave myself fro-



wardly in Thy covenant, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“Destroy their tongues, O Lord, and divide them, for I have seen cruelty and strife in the city. But I will call upon Thee, O Lord, and Thou wilt save me. Amen.

“O Lord, send down from heaven, and save me from the reproof of them that would swallow me. Send out Thy mercy and truth, for my soul is among lions : I lie among the children of men that are set on fire, whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword. O deliver me, and I shall magnify Thy name for ever. Amen.

“I am become a monster to many, but Thou art my sure trust. O be Thou my anchor for ever. Amen.

“O remember, Lord, the rebuke that Thy servant hath, and how I do bear in my bosom the rebukes of many people. O remember me. Amen.”

After languishing in prison for three years, he was at length brought to trial on the 13th of March, 1644. For the details of that wicked mockery of justice, the reader is referred to the pages of Heylyn, Lawson, or Le Bas. We shall merely offer a few extracts from the archbishop's own account of his trials and troubles.

In his speech before the house of lords, in answer to Sargeant Wilde, he says :—“As for religion, I was born and bred up in and under the Church of England, as it yet stands established by law. I have by God's blessing, and the favour of my prince, grown up in it to the years which are now upon me, and to the place of preferment which I yet bear ; and in this Church, by the grace and goodness of God, I resolve to die. I have, ever since I understood aught in divinity, kept one constant tenor in this my profession, without variation or shifting from one opinion to another, for any worldly ends ; and if my conscience would have suffered me to shift tenets in religion with time and occasion, I could easily have slid through all the difficulties which

have pressed upon me in this kind. But, of all diseases, I have ever hated a palsy in religion; well knowing, that too often a dead palsy ends that disease, in the fearful forgetfulness of God and His judgments. Ever since I came in place, I laboured nothing more than that the external public worship of God (too much slighted in most parts of this kingdom) might be preserved, and that with as much decency and uniformity as might be; being still of opinion that unity cannot long continue in the Church, where uniformity is shut out at the Church door. And I evidently saw that the public neglect of God's service in the outward face of it, and the nasty lying of many places dedicated to that service, had almost cast a damp upon the true and inward worship of God, which, while we live in the body, needs external helps, and all little enough to keep it in any vigour. And this I did to the uttermost of my knowledge, according both to law and canon, and with the consent and liking of the people; nor did any command issue out from me against the one, or without the other, that I knew of.

“Farther, my lords, give me leave, I beseech you, to tell you this also; that I have as little acquaintance with recusants of any sort as I believe any man of place in England hath: and for my kindred, no one of them was ever a recusant but Sir William Webb, grandchild to my uncle Sir William Webb, some time lord mayor of London; and him, with some of his children, I reduced back again to the Church of England, as is well known, and I as able to prove.

“One thing more I humbly desire may be thought on; it is this: I am fallen into a great deal of obloquy in matter of religion, and that so far as that it is charged in the articles, that I have endeavoured to advance and bring in Popery. Perhaps, my lords, I am not ignorant what party of men have raised this scandal upon me, nor for what end, nor perhaps by

whom set on ; but, however, I would fain have a good reason given me, (if my conscience lead me that way, and that with my conscience I could subscribe to the Church of Rome,) what should have kept me here (before my imprisonment) to endure the libels, and the slanders, and the base usage in all kinds, which have been put upon me, and these to end in this question for my life : I say I would fain know a good reason of this. For first, my lords, is it because of any pledges I have in the world to sway me against my conscience? No sure. For I have nor wife nor children, to cry out upon me to stay with them ; and if I had, I hope the call of my conscience should be heard above them. Or, secondly, is it because I was loth to leave the honour and the profit of the place I was risen unto? Surely no : for I desire your lordships, and all the world else should know, I do much scorn honour and profit, both the one and the other, in comparison of my conscience. Besides, it cannot be imagined by any reasonable man, but that if I could have complied with Rome, I should not have wanted either honour or profit. And suppose I could not have so much of either as here I had ; yet sure would my conscience have served me that way, less of either with my conscience would have prevailed with me, more than greater against my conscience.

“Or, thirdly, is it because I lived here at ease, and was loth to venture the loss of that? Not so, neither. For whatsoever the world may be pleased to think of me, I have led a very painful life, and such as I could have been very well content to change, had I well known how. And had my conscience led me that way, I am sure I might have lived at far more ease, and either have avoided the barbarous libellings, and other bitter and grievous scorns which I have here endured, or at the least been out of the hearing of them. Nay, my lords, I am as innocent in this business of religion, as free from all practice, or so much as thought of practice, for



any alteration to Popery, or any way blemishing the true Protestant religion established in the Church of England, as I was when my mother first bare me into the world. And let nothing be spoken against me but truth, and I do here challenge whatsoever is between heaven and hell, to say their worst against me in point of my religion; in which, by God's grace, I have ever hated dissimulation; and had I not hated it, perhaps it might have been better for me for worldly safety, than now it is. But it can no way become a Christian bishop to halt with<sup>th</sup> God.

“Lastly, if I had any purpose to blast the true religion established in the Church of England, and to introduce Popery, sure I took a very wrong way to it. For, my lords, I have stayed as many that were going to Rome, and reduced as many that were already gone, as (I believe) any bishop or other minister in this kingdom hath done; and some of them men of great abilities, and some of them persons of great place. And is this the way, my lords, to introduce Popery? I beseech your lordships consider it well. For surely if I had blemished the true Protestant religion, I could not have settled such men in it: and if I had purposed to introduce Popery, I would never have reduced such men from it. And though it please the author of the Popish royal favourite to say that scarce one of the swaying lord prelates is able to say that ever he converted one Papist to our religion, yet how void of charity this speech of his is, and how full of falsehood, shall appear by the number of those persons whom, by God's blessing upon my labours, I have settled in the true Protestant religion established in England. And, with your lordship's leave, I shall name them, that you may see both their number and their condition—though I cannot set them down in that order of time in which I either converted or settled them.”

He then mentions twenty persons whom he prevented

from going over to the Church of Rome, of which Church the pious and tolerant Puritans had so great a dread. The archbishop continues:—"After I had ended this speech I was commanded to withdraw. As I went from the bar, there was Alderman Hoyle of York, and some other, which I knew not, very angry, and saying it was a very strange conversion that I was like to make of them, with other terms of scorn. I went patiently into the little committee-chamber at the entering into the house. Thither Mr. Peters followed me in great haste, and began to give me ill language, and told me that he and other ministers were able to name thousands that they had converted. I knew him not, as having never seen him (to my remembrance) in my life, though I had heard enough of him. And as I was going to answer him, one of my counsel, Mr. Hearn, seeing how violently he began, stepped between us, and told him of his uncivil carriage towards me in my affliction; and indeed he came as if he would have struck me. By this time some occasion brought the Earl of Essex into that room, and Mr. Hearn complained to him of Mr. Peters's usage of me, who very honourably checked him for it and sent him forth. Not long after, Mr. Hearn was set upon by Alderman Hoyle, and used as coarsely as Peters had used me, and (as far as I remember) only for being of counsel with such a one as I, though he was assigned to that office by the lords. What put them into this choler I know not, unless they were angry to hear me say so much in my own defence; especially for the conversion of so many, which I think they little expected. For the next day a great lord met a friend of mine, and grew very angry with him about me, not forbearing to ask what I meant to name the particulars which I had mentioned in the end of my speech, saying many godly ministers had done more. And not long after this (the day I now remember not), Mr. Peters came and preached at Lambeth, and there told them in the pulpit that a

great prelate, their neighbour, (or in words to that effect,) had bragged in the parliament house that he had converted two and twenty, but that he had wisdom enough not to tell how many thousands he had perverted, with much more abuse. God of His mercy relieve me from these reproaches, and lay not these men's causeless malice to their charge!

"After a little stay I received my dismissal for that time, and a command to appear again the next day at nine in the morning, which was my usual hour to attend, though I was seldom called into the house in two hours after."

The impossibility of finding Archbishop Laud guilty of treason by any even obsolete law, or even, as Guizot expresses it, (ii. 84, Eng. Trans.,) by "the tyrannical traditions of parliament," made his trial a weak and complicated process, which would soon have weighed down a "weak old man" with a less stout heart than Laud. There were two sets of articles put in against him, styled original and additional articles; and on March 28, 1644, they had only reached the 5th and 6th original and the 9th additional article.

We will proceed now to July 17, the eighteenth day of hearing, when he says:—"The first charge was, that I deny them (the French and Dutch Reformed Congregations) to be a Church; for they say that I say plainly in my book against Fisher, that No Bishop, no Church. Now it is well known they have no bishops, and therefore no Church. The passage in my book is an inference of St. Jerome's opinion, no declaration of my own. And if they or any other be aggrieved at St. Jerome for writing so, they may answer him. But they have now left me never a book in my study, so I cannot make them any fuller answer without viewing the place, than themselves help me to by their own confession; which is, that he adds this exception, 'that none but a bishop can ordain, but in casu necessitatis,' which is the opinion of many



learned and moderate divines. Yet this is very considerable in the business, whether an inevitable necessity be cast upon them, or they pluck a kind of necessity upon themselves.

“Secondly. They say ‘I disliked the giving of this title Anti-christ to the Pope.’ No, I did not simply dislike it, but I advised Bishop Hall, if he thought it good, not to affirm it so positively. Here Mr. Nicholas fell extreme foul upon me, in so much that I could not but wonder at their patience which heard him. Among other titles bestowed upon me, many and gross, he called me over and over again, *Pander to the Whore of Babylon*. I was much moved, and humbly desired the lords, that if my crimes were such as that I might not be used like an archbishop, yet I might be used like a Christian; and that were it not for the duty which I owe to God and my own innocency, I would desert my defence before I would endure such language in such an honourable presence.

“The third charge was out of a paper, which Bishop Hall, about the time when he wrote his book in defence of Episcopacy, sent unto me, containing divers propositions concerning Episcopal government; in which, either he or I or both say, (for that circumstance I remember not,) ‘That Church government by bishops is not alterable by human law.’ To this I answered, that bishops might be regulated and limited by human laws in those things which are but incidents to their calling. But their calling, so far as it is *Jure Divino*, by divine right, cannot be taken away. They charge farther, that I say this is the doctrine of the Church of England. And so I think it is. For Bishop Bilson set out a book in the queen’s time, intituled, the Perpetual Government. And if the government by bishops be perpetual, as he there very learnedly proves through the whole book, it will be hard for any Christian nation to out it. Nor is this his judgment alone, but of the whole Church

of England. For in the Preface to the Book of Ordination are these words:—‘From the Apostles’ time there have been three orders of ministers in the Church of Christ, bishops, priests, and deacons.’ Where it is evident that in the judgment of the Church of England, Episcopacy is a different, not *degree* only, but *order*, from priesthood, and so hath been reputed from the Apostles’ times. And this was then read to the lords. And the law of England is as full for it as the Church. For the statute in the eighth of the queen absolutely confirms all and every part of this Book of Ordination: where also, the law calls it the high estate of prelacy. And Calvin, (if my old memory do not fail me,) upon those words of St. John, As My Father sent Me, so send I you, &c., says thus upon that place, Eandem illis imponit Personam ac idem Juris assignat. And, if our Saviour Christ put the same person upon the Apostles, and assigned to them the same right which His Father gave Him, it will prove a sour work to throw their successors the bishops out of the Church after sixteen hundred years’ continuance; and in the meantime cry out against innovation. For either Christ gave this power to His Apostles only—and that will make the Gospel a thing temporary, and confined to the Apostles’ times—or else He gave the same *power*, though not with such eminent *gifts*, to their successors also, to propagate the same Gospel to the end of the world, as St. Paul tells us he did.—Ephes. iv. 11. Now all the primitive Church, all along gives bishops to be the Apostles’ successors, and then it would be well thought on, what right any Christian State hath (be their absolute power what it will) to turn bishops out of that right in the Church which Christ hath given them.”

The trial occupied twenty-one days, in the course of six months, during which time Prynne, the chief manager of the cause on the part of the dissenters, kept a school of instruction for the preparation of the

witnesses, wherein his tampering was so palpable and foul," that a barrister of credit, who was a stranger to Laud, declared that "he could not but pity him, and cry shame upon it." The familiar discourse, and secret writings of the martyr had been scrutinized, and his conduct, both public and private, as a bishop and a counsellor, in the star-chamber and the high commission court, had been subjected to the most severe investigation. After his able defence of himself, the lords allowed him counsel to speak to matters of law. They contended that not one of the offences alleged against him amounted to high treason; that their number could not change their quality; that the description of an offence so vague and indeterminate, ought never to be admitted; otherwise, the slightest transgression might, under that denomination, be converted into the highest crime known to the law.

Such was the trial of Archbishop Laud, in which, as his enemy Prynne confesses, he made as full, as gallant, as pithy a defence, and spake as much for himself as was possible for the wit of man to invent, and that with so much art, vivacity, oratory, audacity, and confidence, that he shewed not the least acknowledgment of guilt in any of the particulars which were charged upon him. If we compare his demeanour during this latter part of his life with the character given of him by Lord Clarendon, we may see that suffering had done somewhat of its sanctifying work upon him. "He was a man of great parts and very exemplary virtues, and discredited by some popular natural infirmities, the greatest of which was, (besides a hasty, sharp way of expressing himself,) that he believed innocence of heart and integrity of manners, was a guard strong enough to secure any man in his voyage through this world, in what company soever he travelled, and through what ways soever he was to pass; and sure never any man was better supplied with that provision. He was always



maligned and persecuted by those who were of the Calvinian faction, which was then very popular, and who, according to their usual maxim and practice, call every man they do not love *Papist*; and under this senseless appellation they created him many troubles and vexations. He was a man of great courage and resolution, and being most assured within himself, that he proposed no end in all his actions and designs but what was pious and just, (as sure no man had ever a heart more entire to the king, the Church, or his country,) he never studied the easiest ways to those ends; he thought, it may be, that any art or industry that way would discredit, at least make the integrity of the end suspected, let the cause be what it will. He did court persons too little; nor cared to make his designs and purposes appear as candid as they were, by shewing them in any other dress than their own natural beauty, though perhaps in too rough a manner; and did not consider enough what men said, or were like to say of him. No man was a greater or abler enemy to Popery; no man a more resolute and devout son of the Church of England. He was prosecuted by lawyers assigned to that purpose, out of those who, from their own antipathy to the Church and bishops, or from some disobligations received from him, were sure to bring passion, animosity, and malice enough of their own, what evidence soever they had from others. And they did treat him with all the rudeness, reproach, and barbarity imaginable—with which his judges were not displeased. He defended himself with great and undaunted courage, and less passion than was expected from his constitution; answered all their objections with clearness and irresistible reason; and convinced all impartial men of his integrity, and his detestation of all treasonable intentions. So that though few excellent men have ever had fewer friends to their persons, yet all reasonable men absolved him from any foul crime that the law could take notice

of, and punish. However, when they had said all they could against him, and he all for himself that need to be said, and no such crime appearing as the lords, as the supreme court of judicatory, would take upon them to judge him to be worthy of death, they resorted to their legislative power, and by ordinance of parliament, as they called it, that is, by a determination of those members who sat in the houses, (whereof in the house of peers there were not above twelve,) they appointed him to be put to death as guilty of high treason. The first time that two houses of parliament had ever assumed that jurisdiction, or that ever ordinance had been made to such a purpose; nor could any rebellion be more against the law than that murderous act."

When the trial was over, and the ordinance passed for his execution, he was called and asked "what he could say more, why he should not suffer death? Now the king, seeing the great danger this faithful bishop was in, had sent him secretly from Oxford, which holy and hospitable city was to the last a sanctuary for the loyal subjects of the king, a full pardon, signed and sealed with the great seal of England. The archbishop had received it with great joy, as it was a testimony of the king's great affection to him, and care of him. And at this, when he was questioned, "What he could say more why he should not suffer death?" he made answer, "that he had the king's gracious pardon, which he pleaded, and tendered to them, and desired that it might be allowed." Whereupon they sent him back to the Tower, and, with no long debate, set the royal pardon aside, as without power in this judgment; as though it had been ordered that each fresh step they took in this cruel business should have a new weight of sin to bear, which, God knows, it need not.

On the 6th of January, six peers, and it was strange to find so many in the English peerage, to wit, Philip Earl of Pembroke, Henry Earl of Kent, William Earl of

Salisbury, Oliver Earl of Bolingbroke, Dudley Lord North, and William Lord Gray of Wark, all of them Presbyterians, condemned the archbishop to be *hung* on the 10th of January next. On the same day with this unrighteous sentence, parliament abolished the Book of Common Prayer; which made Antony Wood to say, speaking of "the king's and the Church's martyr," that he was "a man of such integrity, learning, devotion, courage, as, had he lived in the primitive times, would have given him another name; whom, though the cheated multitude were taught to misconceive (for those honoured him most who best knew him), yet impartial posterity will know how to value him, when they hear that the rebels sentenced him on the same day they voted down the Liturgy of the Church of England."

Meanwhile the manner of his death troubled the good archbishop not a little; and with a deeply Christian magnanimity and largeness of heart, whatever some poor, unworthy minds have thought or said about it, he was not above petitioning his malicious enemies, that, considering he was a bishop in the Church, he might die by beheading rather than by the gibbet, which request the commons at first violently refused, but afterwards assented unto.

The passing of the ordinance being signified to him by the then lieutenant of the Tower, he neither entertained the news with a stoical apathy, nor bewailed his fate with weak and womanish lamentations, (to which extremes most men are carried in this case,) but heard it with so even and so smooth a temper, as shewed he neither was ashamed to live, nor afraid to die. The time between the sentence and execution he spent in prayers and supplications to the Lord his God, having obtained, though not without some difficulty, his chaplain, Dr. Sterne, who afterwards sat in the chair of York, to attend upon him. His chaplains, Drs. Heywood and Martin, he much wished might be with him. But it



seems it was too much for him to ask. So instead, two violent Presbyterians, Marshall and Palmer, were ordered by parliament to give him religious consolations, which consolations his grace quietly declined. Indeed, little preparation was needed to receive that blow, which could not but be welcome, because long expected. For so well was he studied in the art of dying, especially in the last and strictest part of his imprisonment, that by continual fastings, watchings, prayers, and such like acts of Christian humiliation, his flesh was rarified into spirit, and the whole man so fitted for eternal glories that he was more than half in heaven before death brought his bloody but triumphant chariot to convey him thither. He that had so long been a confessor, could not but think it a release of miseries to be made a martyr.

On the evening of the 9th, Sheriff Chambers, of London, brought the warrant for his execution. In preparation to so sad a work, he betook himself to his own, and desired also the prayers of others, and particularly of Dr. Holdsworth, fellow-prisoner in that place for a year and a half, though all that time there had not been the least converse betwixt them. This evening before his passover, the night before the dismal combat betwixt him and death, after he had refreshed his spirits with a moderate supper, he betook himself unto his rest, and slept very soundly till the time came, in which his servants were appointed to attend his rising; a most assured sign of a soul prepared.

He was executed on the 10th of January on which day he completed his life of seventy-one years, thirteen weeks, and four days.

In the morning he was early at his prayers, at which he continued till Pennington, lieutenant of the Tower, and other public officers, came to conduct him to the scaffold, which he ascended, it is said, with so brave a courage, such a cheerful countenance, as if he had mounted rather to behold a triumph than be made a sacrifice, and

came not there to die, but to be translated. And though some rude and uncivil people reviled him as he passed along with opprobrious language, as loth to let him go to the grave in peace, yet it never discomposed his thoughts, nor disturbed his patience; for he had profited so well in the school of Christ that “when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed his cause to Him that judgeth righteously.”

The works of the archbishop are as follows:—1. Seven Sermons, preached and printed on several occasions, reprinted in 1651, 8vo. 2. Short Annotations upon the Life and Death of the most august King James, drawn up at the desire of George Duke of Bucks. 3. Answer to the Remonstrance made by the House of Commons in 1628. 4. His Diary, by Wharton, in 1694; with six other pieces, and several letters, especially one to Sir Kenelm Digby, on his embracing Popery. 5. The second volume of the Remains of Archbishop Laud, written by himself, &c., 1700, fol. 6. *Officium Quotidianum*; or a Manual of Private Devotions, 1650, 8vo. 7. A Summary of Devotions, 1667, 12mo. There are about eighteen letters of his to Gerard John Vossius, printed by Colomesius in his edition of *Vossii Epistol.* Lond. 1690, fol. Some other letters of his are published at the end of Usher's Life, by Dr. Parr, 1686, fol. And a few more by Dr. Twells, in his Life of Dr. Pocock, prefixed to that author's theological works, 1645, in 2 vols. folio.—*Fuller. Anthony Wood. Rushworth. Clarendon. Heylyn. Lawson. Le Bas. Autobiography. Private Devotions.*

LEEDS:

T. HARRISON, PRINTER,

55, BRIGGATE.



















